

THE REVIEW AND EXPOSITOR

Vol. XVI.

October, 1919

No. 4

SOME NOTES ON PREACHING AND PREACHERS PRIOR TO THE REFORMATION.* §

F. M. Powell, Th.D.

Through the ages the pulpit has stood as the foremost teacher of the religious life. Many times its teaching has been weak and warped, but in every age there have been voices, tried and true, calling men back to God. To sketch, simply or exhaustively, the leading preachers through these years would be not only impossible in these limits, but would give scant justice to the thousands of men who have responded freely and effectively to the Lord's command to preach as we go. Many of these noble voices have ceased with the passing of their day. External records have left no trace of them; but in the spring eternal of human experience and struggle their line has gone out through all the earth and their words to the end of the world. God has never left himself without witness,

§Inaugural address as Assistant Professor of Homiletics and Ethics and Sociology, Southern Baptist Theological Seminary.

*The nature and limits of this article precluded the giving of references as they were used. Besides commentaries, encyclopedias and general Church Histories, I have consulted freely such works as Ker, Broadus, Dargan and Pattison on the History of Preaching; Kirk-rick and others on the Prophets, and many volumes of a more or less popular nature. From many of these I have used quotations.—F.M.P.

and the voice of His messengers has continued, with varying clearness and power, from the beginning till now.

We may well deplore the loss of the records of many faithful men, and can only covet fuller accounts of others of whom we have but a voice crying in the night. "We catch its echoes in the controversies of Christendom; in the ecclesiastical movements of the ages; in the reformations by which religion has been purified and renewed; and the great missionary advances of the church universal." The real preacher has ministered to the individual, social and national life of the race. At times he has gone to extremes in his emphasis—often forgetting that the individual, or society, or the nation, is without meaning except in relation to the others; but in no age except our own has he been very widely indicted for failing to minister to his own generation. "He has dealt with the present duty as well as with the final destiny of men and women about him; with their relation to the life that now is as well as to the life which is to come." He has been accused, many times rightly, of being "other worldly." One might add, however, that the other worldly preacher has been much less a problem than the worldly one.

The preacher, of all men, should be the possessor of all time, past, present and future. While his initial experience lies in the past and his ultimate hope is in the future, yet his only sphere of labor is in the present—and it is always a glorious present, pregnant with obligation and opportunity; peopled with men and women who toil and shirk, who sorrow and rejoice, who lose and win; but always men and women who know how to respond only in terms of their present day life and language. For him, with the only message that can heal the wounded world, to fail or refuse to minister to "his own generation by the council of God" is to invite a continuance of shipwrecked faith which has marked the pathway of Christian progress. It must be a disappointment to Him who sent us to note through all the ages a generation of

preachers who are a generation behind—preachers who have no vital connection with the life forces around them. But this has been offset in every generation by preachers who were presagers of the new day, who have lit the torch of construction and reconstruction.

There has been endless controversy in trying to decide which has influenced the other more, the age or the preacher. But one thing is certain, that the preacher who has not been influenced by his age will have little if any influence upon it. His message will be tested both by its divineness in experience and its fitness to living issues. The truth that has **found** the preacher will find other men. The personal element must always bulk large. Personality is God's method and charm; it must be the preacher's. There is little danger that the preacher of today will be removed from his age; the real danger is that while trying to be of it, he will miss its reality by adopting only the sensational and superficial. These may produce a show of results that yield to mechanical tabulation, but they fail in producing "a spiritual service tested by spiritual measures and motives." Many of the seemingly established things of our day are but symptoms of life's search for the real. To bring a message in keeping with surface manifestations is to bring one which men rarely desire and never need. Men are demanding an instructive pulpit, one that grows from an increasing appreciation of God and men, and eventuates in a life that is stable as well as productive. "If the social consciousness of the age is to develop a finer sense of individuality, and so a nobler responsibility, the preacher must present a gospel that shall arouse and train the conscience, and inspire and direct the new social forces that are trying to realize the Kingdom of God on earth." To do this does not require a combination of all the so-called "gifts." Not many mighty through the ages have been chosen, but the real succession has continued through men who, like Paul, have "come not with excellency of speech but in demonstration of the Spirit and of Power."

To rightly study preaching one must begin with the Hebrew Prophets, for the pulpit is not peculiar to Christianity. The persuasiveness in personal presence and the human voice gives an ease to the spread of spoken truth that could hardly have been overlooked till Christ came. "Its roots lie far back of the Christian era." However far in the past its roots may have struck, one is safe in affirming that beginning with the prophets and continuing till now, men have spoken as they were moved by the Holy Ghost. The writer of the Epistle to the Hebrews opens his wonderful appeal by affirming an intimate and vital connection between the Jewish and Christian revelations. In both of them God spoke; as Kirkpatrick has well put it: "God having spoken in the prophets..... spoke in a Son." Well might this message at first be in "many fragments and many manners," but in essence it was progressively the same till God began to speak fully in a Son.

One cannot live in the atmosphere of the Hebrew prophets without discovering how thoroughly human they were. Truly they spoke God's words but they spoke them as men to men. The prophet was more of a preparer than a predictor, more of a "forthteller than a foreteller." However, they were vitally concerned with the future. They believed with conviction that they "were the appointed heralds of the divine purpose for Israel, and through Israel, for the world." The wealth of this conception of a world mission, no doubt, had much to do with the predictive element of their prophecy. These mighty men could never have been so far ahead of their times unless they had lived among the very forces and issues which surrounded them. Their message is for all ages because it was a message from God to sinful men of that age.

What a conspicuous figure the prophet has been! "He is by far the most arresting figure in the Old Testament. When he takes the stage all other actors are

dwarfed. Prince and priest alike are insignificant in his presence." What a noble succession of men through whom God has spoken! Even Enoch has a message of judgment. Would we have listened to Noah, the preacher of righteousness? Surely heaven's sanction accompanies Abraham's words: "Let there be no strife between thee and me." Jacob, Joseph and Judah prepared the way for the more gifted Aaron. Yea, the messages of Moses, who claimed to be slow of speech, ring with a divine eloquence of increasing beauty. Joshua continues to speak from God to men. David, the poet, possessed rare charm as a speaker. Nathan's tact and directness will remain as a model for centuries to come.

However, the real preachers of Old Testament times were the prophets, and with them preaching became a separate task for which men were trained. If Samuel is to be called the first of a long line of prophets, preaching as an art could scarcely have been born at a more opportune time. Israel's condition was extremely low. Priest and people were corrupt. The nation must have instruction in spiritual truth. Only the form of their holy religion remained. Through their grasping king he could say to the nation, "Behold, to obey is better than sacrifice, and to hearken than the fat of rams." The low spiritual estate of Israel no doubt influenced greatly the rise of the schools of the prophets and Samuel's connection with them.

In Elijah we discover another decided departure. Rugged, like the mountains in which he dwelt, his messages "are flashes of lightning in a dark night revealing to us the whole man and his surroundings." It is little less startling to us than to Ahab as he comes, unannounced, into his presence, just long enough to say: "As Jehovah, the God of Israel liveth, before whom I stand, there shall be neither dew nor rain these years but according to my word." The "Troubler of Israel" indeed! Never an Elijah that did not trouble Israel. Perhaps no

picture of him is so true to life as when he stands before the assembled prophets of Baal and defies them in the name of his God.

Not altogether unlike Elijah is Amos, who comes after the lapse of more than a century. He was not of the prophetic schools but he was a keen observer of men and things. His utterances fairly blaze as he thunders against the wrongs of Israel and the nations. These sins, which are to be punished, are such as cruelty, covetousness, injustice and idolatry. Both Israel and Judah were prosperous and the sins which accompany wealth were rife. Luxury, excesses in eating and drinking, violence and robbery, oppression of the poor, injustice in courts, and ceremonialism in religion were the outstanding characteristics. Small wonder then, that his message in epitome is, "Let judgment roll down as the waters and righteousness as a mighty stream."

One hesitates to pass over Hosea, whose sad experiences in domestic life make him tenderly fit for persuading a perverse and adulterous nation to return to a loving Father, who can say, "I can heal their backslidings, I will love them freely for mine anger is turned away from him." Likewise, a Micah, who in recoiling from the social sins of his time can utter, "What doth Jehovah require of thee but to do justly and to love mercy and to walk humbly with thy God." But the royal line of prophets who spoke God's message during the stormy days before the exile who comforted and inspired God's people during their forced sojourn from their native land, and who were their divine heralds in every reconstruction, must be omitted here.

A word, however, about Isaiah is imperative for he stands at the head—in time and power—of a long line of city preachers, "whose life and work have been given in some metropolis, and whose heart and brain have been taxed to the utmost in the discharge of their delicate but grave responsibilities." He is also, perhaps, the most

cultured man of his day and certainly the most eloquent. In spite of the fall of the Northern Kingdom in the last quarter of the eighth century, and the constantly impending peril of Jerusalem, Isaiah remained as the interpreter of Jehovah's purpose to preserve that city. "The genius of Isaiah is so universal, showing such variety of style, eloquence, brilliancy and music" that he is at once a messenger worthy of any occasion. "Of the other prophets," writes Ewald, "all the more celebrated ones were distinguished by some special excellence and peculiar power, whether of speech or deed; in Isaiah all the powers and all the beauties of prophetic speech and deed combine to form a symmetrical whole; he is distinguished less by any special excellence than by the symmetry and perfection of all his powers." Small wonder that generations after him should conclude that such brilliancy comes from a cluster rather than a single star.

"Isaiah was a kingly man in character and service as well as in genius." His vision of Jehovah, high and lifted up, is the secret of his message for Jew and Gentile. In the very center of the national life he exercised his ministry, not only "as a religious and social reformer, a preacher of righteousness and godliness, but as a keen, far-sighted statesman. He observed the political movements of the day at home and abroad, and criticised them from the divine standpoint." Some one has suggested that Isaiah's ministry was supremely great because it lacked none of the three essential elements, viz.: instruction, rebuke, and comfort. He showed himself mighty in the Scriptures. He fed the flock over which he had been called as overseer. He was indeed a shepherd after God's pattern. No seer of any day has penetrated more deeply into the social wrongs of his day than did Isaiah: "Woe unto them that join house to house, that annex field to field." "The spoil of the poor is in your house." How piercingly he exposed the sins of his day in king, priest or people; how keenly he instructed great

and small in the message of Jehovah; how tenderly he comforted a penitent generation with the reassurance of a loving God; with what insight and foresight he announces God's plan for the salvation of the whole world, and all in language so chaste and elevated, that one doubts not that they came from lips, purified by a coal from heaven's altar.

After Malachi, for nearly four centuries the glow of prophecy almost ceases, just here and there a flash, like an occasional lightning in the twilight. The prophet becomes neutralized in the priest. Persian, Greek, Maccabean and Roman, have in turn held heavy hands upon the chosen race. Small wonder that an outraged and discouraged people came in multitudes to hear the preaching of John the Baptist "on whom rested the last beams of the sunset and the first flush of the dawn." A brief but pregnant ministry serves his purpose to introduce Jesus, the Messiah, with whom Christian preaching begins.

One would fain linger here to search for the secret of His authority and submission, His simplicity and profundity, His courage and tenderness, His unity and variety; His freshness in His devotion to truth, His faith in men as the potential sons of the Father, His consistent habits of prayer and work, and most of all, His tact and sympathy in dealing with individuals, whether at night or noonday, or in dealing with multitudes of men and women who impressed Him as sheep without a shepherd.

This Son of Man, Son of God, beginning with the Twelve, has continued to send messengers of divine truth, whom He accompanies as they carry out His commission. Out of the thousands of these, God's anointed, we must notice in brief but a few. Through Paul, the most outstanding convert to Christianity, and the peerless missionary to the Gentiles, God laid the foundations upon which the structure of Christianity was to build. After his death, for at least a hundred years, we have scarcely any records of sermons, but without doubt the teaching

and example of the Apostles, "the humble circumstances of the early believers and the heathen philosophies of that age" profoundly affected early preaching. The effect of these influences would of course, vary according the personality of the preacher himself. While preaching was almost universal among the early Christians it was free, informal and almost wholly ethical. "Lay preaching was not the exception, it was the rule."* * * "In these first centuries almost all the Christians preached," not in the way of finished discourses, but as "talks" to the people during which they often asked questions.

In Justin Martyr (120-190) we no doubt have a stalwart preacher, and from him have the earliest account of Christian worship. Clement of Alexandria, the great Greek theologian, was worthily ambitious to win the cultured class—out of which he came—and did telling service in that respect, both as teacher and preacher. "In him, first of the preachers of those early years, we find the powerful influence of the fascinating but perilous use of allegory."

If Clement began the method of allegorizing all Scripture it was left for his pupil, Origen, (c. 185-230) to carry it to its bitter consummation. He was the disciple of Clement, and as often occurs, the pupil outstrips the master. It was Origen who made the Alexandrian School become "the chief seat of Christian learning for generations to come." He was a man of culture and deep piety, a preacher of marked ability, but his exegetical qualities overshadow his powers as a preacher. His untiring zeal and epoch making discourses, (for he was among the very first to preach real discourses) must remain to the eternal shame of the lazy young preacher of today.

In Tertullian (c. 155-225), born and bred in heathenism, and who did not become a Christian till middle life, we find one of the most individual and remarkable personalities of the ancient Church. While he never entirely emancipated himself from his early teaching, and while

there was a mingling of pagan and Christian in his preaching, yet "when brought face to face with danger he was true as steel." A single paragraph from his famous Apology throws floods of light on the preaching of his day: "We continually preach and press the duties of the Gospel with our utmost powers and arguments, we exhort, we reprove, we pass the divine censure of excommunication with solemnity."

In Cyprian (200-258), the intellectual heir of Tertullian, we find possibly, the most eloquent of the early preachers. His teaching is the ripe expression of those tendencies that were developing the Catholic Church. With little thought, perhaps, as to the real outcome, and with an eloquence that spell bound both heathen and Christian, hear him say: "Whoever he may be and whatever he may be, he who is not in the Church of Christ is not a Christian." Again, "He can no longer have God for his father who does not have the church for his mother. * *. * There is no salvation out of the church." He was a man of wealth, education, and position, who devoted his splendid powers to the cause of Christ as he understood it.

Three names, prominent in the fourth century, deserve mention here; Athanasius, Basil and Gregory Nazianzen, for they belong to that period when "Christian preaching springs into exuberant growth and blossoms into glorious beauty." In the early part of the fourth century persecution dies out, sermons may be freely published, and at the same time young men aspiring to the ministry may have the unmolested advantage of the best learning. However, these three men will be remembered chiefly for their active part in the great Arian controversy which began about 320.

Athanasius (295-373), though not a great speculative theologian, was a giant character and stood like a Gibraltar for his convictions at any cost. We are poorer that we do not possess specimens of his sermons; and we would

consider him a greater preacher if we did not always remember him as controversialist. He rendered an immense service to the Christian faith of his day and of all time by largely fixing the doctrine of the Deity of Christ. Gibbon has fittingly said: "The immortal name of Athanasius will never be separated from the Catholic doctrine of the Trinity, to whose defence he consecrated every moment and faculty of his being."

Basil, (330-380), a greater preacher than Athanasius, also largely devoted his life to battling Arianism. To him preaching was an art, and he manifests ability in the construction of discourses superior to any preacher who had preceded him. He charmed both rich and poor by his matchless oratory. His eloquence, however, did not preclude his being practical for he really excelled in dealing with the sins of daily life. The culture of his age, familiar with controversy in ecclesiastic and philosopher alike, ranks him with Plato and Demosthenes.

In the same school with Basil, Gregory (330-390) studied an artificial and elaborate system of rhetoric from which he never became free. This did him better service in controversy than in his preaching but his style was extreme even when dealing with the most practical themes. "His sermons, attracting men of all classes and opinions, often winning loud applause and tempting the more thoughtful to take furtive notes, were heard from various motives and produced various effects." He himself pictures "the excited hearer breaking out into audible tokens of approval, the antagonist provoked to contradiction, the earnest seeker after truth absorbed in silent meditation."

Chrysostom (347-407), the golden mouthed, was brought up by a religious-minded mother, and early distinguished himself in scholarship and eloquence. After his baptism, about 370, he practised extreme asceticism while he pursued theological studies. He became a hermit about 375 and so remained for six years until in

broken health he returned to Antioch. With 386, the year of his advancement to the priesthood, begins the happiest and most useful period of his life. For twelve years he was the great preacher of Antioch,—probably the ablest that the Oriental church ever possessed. His sermons were exegetical and practical. He denounced with fearless but sincere insight the sins of clergy, people and court. His themes were eminently social—the Christian conduct of life. He was and is unrivalled in his power of appeal to “the feelings, the fancy and the conscience.” But the same enthusiasts that will force him into the bishopric at Constantinople, will assist in banishing him. Chrysostom never forgot for one moment that he was “dealing with human beings and human life.” His logical and theological qualifications are superior but never supreme with him. He was always more anxious for souls than sermons. Horne has beautifully said: “The people flocked to him and hung upon his lips, not only because of his oratory, but because he knew them so well, loved them so much, and talked to them about those actual, homely facts of daily life which make up the greater part of one’s existence.”

Ambrose has been greatly over-estimated as a preacher by Catholic historians, for his sermons possess small value either in their subject matter or in form. He was merciless in his allegorizing, following the method of Origen, Hippolytus and Philo, whom he diligently studied and from whom he constantly borrowed. However, the title “The Christian Cicero” would hardly have been given to him had he not manifested some rare charms in speech. Unlike many omniverous borrowers, he was a **good** one, and used effectively his imported ideas. Ker is not far from the truth when he says that “the two chief merits of Ambrose are that he gave us church music and helped to give us Augustine.”

Augustine, (354-430) one of the most serviceable preachers before the Reformation, is remembered prim-

arily as a theologian. So formative was his thinking that he is the outstanding theological authority for the middle ages and the Roman church, as well as the "father of the theology of the Reformation." Both his theology and his preaching are colored by his sense of rescue from deep sin and passion. His life was one of constant toil and struggle. His book, "Confessions," should be ranked among the classics of Christian literature. At meetings of the bishops Augustine was always assigned to preach the sermon. He has left nearly 400 sermons and contemporary accounts give glowing reports of his power as a preacher. Passionate in temperament, logical in mind, "he understood how to rank wisdom before rhetoric and truth before its expression." His preaching was brief, pungent, pregnant, and withal so saturated with a warm devotion that it has placed all succeeding preachers in his debt.

But scarcely had the morning breeze of the "Golden age of ancient preaching" cooled the brows so lately fevered by persecution till the chill of twilight was felt. What persecution had utterly failed to do patronage was beginning to effect. To make Christianity a state religion is to rob it of its very essence. Christianity had conquered Rome only to become the slave of its victim. The union of church and state was beginning to destroy the vital, fundamental and essential elements of Christianity, for spirituality has never advanced by mechanical means. It now becomes official and adopts the spirit and method of the Roman government. All this combined to devitalize spiritual religion and to build up an ecclesiasticism whose logical outcome was the Roman Catholic Church. Ceremonialism, the subverter of preaching, soon eventuates into sacerdotalism by which preaching is neutralized if not destroyed. The Greek bishops who succeeded the exiled Gregory and Chrysostom "degenerate into sycophants and time servers." While the throne of the Caesars was crumbling, a more deadly power was

rising in the ancient metropolis which was again to make her mistress of the world—the priest was to take the place of emperor, and by 600 (a pope) as virtual ruler of the world. “There should be only one empire”—such was the dream of the hierarchy—“and there should be only one church,”—that sounds quite modern—“and the church should control the destinies of the empire. This was the culmination of centuries of intrigue, diplomacy and craft. To these arts the church appealed and as for preaching, save as an instrument, she had little use.” Thus, by stripping Christianity of its vitality and by receiving into the church the conquering tribes from the north “en masse,” the preacher’s voice was hushed; and it will take nearly a millenium after Chrysostom for it to recover.

However, there was preaching throughout the middle ages, of the best of which, perhaps, we have no record, because it attacked the clergy. But safely within the fold were pious men striving to purify the increasingly rotten church and to lead the people aright. Among such would come Gregory the Great, a preacher of no mean ability, who did much to stimulate preaching of a type. Many of his sermons are extant. They keep rather close to the Scripture and seek to give a practical application of it. While his style is natural and popular, “his exegesis is often of the most extravagant kind.” A great administrator and ruler, he chafed under the duties that kept him from preaching. He was missionary in spirit and seems to have been dominated by a Christian motive in his endeavors. To him “belongs the deathless distinction of starting the mission which brought Christianity to the southern parts of Britain.” He has left a rather inferior book on preaching, “showing how to deal with different ages and states of mind according to the ideas of the times.”

In passing, one would mention Bede (673-735) because of his missionary zeal and scholarly work in north

England. No man in his generation swayed a mightier influence than he. He is chiefly remembered today for his translations of Scripture, but in his own times "he was teacher, counsellor, and guide to thousands of his countrymen." He was among the most learned men of his day, a scholar in the classics, besides being both poet and musician. His sermons which remain are in Latin, so probably meant for the clergy. These are brief homilies, giving a running exposition of some passage of Scripture. He was among the first to introduce his subject by a description of the time and place of the Scripture passage, which was indeed a decided gain. In all that remains of his works there is no suggestion of anything insincere or impious.

While Bede was doing his monumental work in England, Boniface was developing the same message in Germany and along the Baltic. He was of noble birth and fine scholarship, having every promise of high ecclesiastical honors, but he chose to go out into the darkest night with the light of the Gospel. Wherever he went, Thuringia, Friesland or Saxony, idolatry shattered before him. Sometimes a sacred oak needed cutting, if so, it got it. At last turning back into pagan Friesland, his first love, he went to his known death by the hand of a people for whom he had done so much. His own description of his inspiring vision of glory, should cause him to be remembered by all who are called upon to suffer. "There shall be life with God without the fear of death; there unending light and never darkness; there safety which no sickness disturbs; there eternal glory with angels and archangels, with patriarchs and prophets, with confessors and virgins, who follow Christ whither-so-ever he goeth."

If shadows in preaching began to lengthen the fifth and sixth centuries, and twilight came in the seventh and eighth, without doubt the ninth and tenth centuries mark that "darkest period before the dawn" in the history of

preaching. Here and there a faithful messenger, in a limited district, who counted not his life as dear unto himself, kept alive the voice of the prophet. These, rather than priests, bishops and cardinals, kept Christianity alive as a reckoning power. Here are Anschar, carrying Christianity into Denmark, Sweden and N. Germany. An Adelbert, a century later going through Poland and Prussia "singing and preaching the Gospel until the lance of a heathen transfixed him." No gloomier period in all Christian history can be found than the tenth century. Political insecurity and ecclesiastical degradation sent fear and failure into the hearts of men. "The coming of the end of the world was the burden of sermon and song. Believers everywhere held that the days of the earth were numbered. * * * But daybreak, not destruction was at hand." During all this dark period preaching, long neglected by a degenerate and ignorant clergy, had gained in simplicity and power as it spread in far off heathen lands. These early missionaries, by carrying the simple Gospel to Germany and Britain, were sowing the seed which were to be harvested in the Reformation. Mohammedanism, long since checked in its universal march, had prepared Europe not only for the Renaissance, but largely for the Crusades, and as a partial result great preachers were to come forth; and with a few of these, who because they labored so well before the Reformation are a part of it, we must close these fragments.

Peter the Hermit was a popular preacher of great power. His fiery enthusiasm, coupled with superior eloquence made him a distinguished factor in the first crusade. Unversed in the learning of the schools, ungainly in appearance and past middle life, he returns from a pilgrimage to Jerusalem to find conditions ripe for completing a task already begun. Believing that the Lord in person had given him a message, and with tireless energy and dauntless enthusiasm, in any place and before all

classes of people, he proclaims the story of the dishonored sepulchre. Pattison quotes from Milman's *Latin Christianity*, a valuable summary of the sources of Peter's success. "His preaching appeals to every passion, to valor, to shame, to indignation and pity, to the pride of the warrior, to the compassion of the man. To the religion of the Christian, to the love of the brethren, to the hatred of the unbeliever, aggravated by his insulting tyranny; to reverence for the Redeemer of the saints; to the desire of expiating sins; to the hope of eternal life." With such appeals he stirred the very foundations of national and domestic life. Religious impulses, long stagnant, were evoked and aroused till men, women and children gave themselves with abandon to be led to privation and slaughter.

Nearly a half century later, and connected in our thinking with the second crusade, comes Bernard of Clairvaux, (1091-1153), a devotedly pious monk. He was nobly born, more so, because of his saintly mother who so impressed him religiously that he grew up with an intense love for the Bible and "a passionate devotion to Christ. To follow the footsteps of his Lord was the delight of his quiet hour and the inspiration of his preaching." He was a man of extraordinary powers in style and discourse. His powers of persuasion were well nigh irresistible. His sermons exhibit careful preparation as would be expected, for the scholastic tendencies were now well under way. He was often in controversy with Abelard, a superior dialectic but an inferior soul, who revelled in the joy of conflict. The character of Bernard will always speak louder than his matchless eloquence and his serene temper which is evidenced in his hymns will live on beside the power and devotion to his Lord which inspired his sermons.

We can never place an entirely fair estimate on the preaching of Peter Waldo for the accounts of him are colored by those whom he opposed. However, nothing

bears richer testimony to the remarkable value of the preaching done by him and his "poor men of Lyons" than that the Dominican order—an order of preachers—was established in the beginning of the thirteenth century to meet these "heretics." Dominic was himself a great preacher, gaining sympathy for his plans from the dignitaries even in Rome. His eloquence, added to his organizing powers gave the Order founded by him immense influence in spite of his later attitude of indifference and worldliness.

Thomas Aquinas, (c. 1225-74) a Dominican, was perhaps the greatest medieval theologian. He was also a peerless preacher and loved to preach with all his great soul. While one of the foremost philosophers of his time, yet the common people heard him gladly. He was a prodigious worker, crowding into his short life a staggering amount of labor. He was consulted constantly on important civil and ecclesiastical questions during his years as teacher, and "yet his pen was busy with results as voluminous as they were important." Intellectually he was a giant, clear, logical and broad. Personally, he was a simple, deeply religious, prayerful man.

The Franciscan Order, founded early in the thirteenth century, did much to revive spiritual Christianity among the laity through their zealous preachers at home, as well as doing much foreign mission work among the Mohammedans of Spain and east Africa. Francis himself, a far more pious man than Dominic, labored under the impulse of the definite conviction that he was sent of God. "Indeed his eloquence was felt rather than apprehended."

Antony of Padua, (1195-1231), entered the Franciscan Order when 25 years old and became one of the greatest preachers of his day. He was early noted for his biblical and patriotic learning. When sent by Francis into northern Italy as a "revival preacher" he met with great success. "Shops were closed and thoroughfares deserted

when he came to any town, and as many as thirty thousand persons would sometimes gather to hear him. His appeals must have been effective for as he spoke men who came to attack him dropped their daggers and sought his embrace. Women cast off their ornaments and sold them for the benefit of the poor, and old and hardened sinners were brought to immediate confession." He often made careful divisions of his sermons, a practice for which he had little precedent. He is ranked by some as the most popular preacher that ever lived. But the belief that he possessed supernatural powers, coupled with the fact of his early death, largely account for this overestimate.

Across the English Channel and contemporary with the mystics on the Continent, and in a more fearless voice, comes Wycliffe, (1324-1384), announcing the revival of spiritual religion. He was a scholar, an organizer and a preacher. More than any man before the Reformation he labored by word and pen to bring home to the people in their own tongue the word of God. To the whole subject of preaching he devoted much thought, putting that thought into action by instituting a company of preachers. "Poor preachers" they were called, but not in the sense that the term could apply to many of us today. Convinced that the Bible was the law of God, Wycliffe determined to give it to the people, and he did it. It is doubtful if England had a scholar his equal, and it was to his and his country's misfortune that he left no follower of conspicuous ability to carry on his work in England. However, the work he did and the work of the Lollards continued to grow for nearly twenty years after his death.

Wycliffe's message indeed sounded over seas and was to be echoed by the inimitable Huss, "the great reformer before the reformation." He faithfully preached the doctrines which seem so natural now, but which were considered so dangerous then, till he was excommunicated, then betrayed, and finally burned at the stake, after de-

claring: "God is my witness that I have never taught or preached that which false witnesses have testified against me. He knows that the great object of all my preaching and writing was to convert men from sin."

In this hasty sketch, leaving out names that many would consider more important than those mentioned, I have endeavored to give progressive glimpses of the times, messages and messengers in the Christian era up to the Reformation. Two or three observations seem worth while. Many of these men were not products of the schools, but they were without exception students. They were prodigious workers, and extremely vital in an age when the mechanical and ceremonial were in ascendancy. Almost without exception they were pious men, unselfish in relinquishing comfort, wealth, position, power—**anything**, that might interfere with their work. And finally, and perhaps at the base of all else, they labored under the sense that they were divinely sent.

Back of us are lights and shadows, but if one wishes to discern, he may trace an unbroken light. Ahead of us are the most glorious days of all times. One looks ahead with optimism, hope and courage. One believes that the next five years are to be critical, yea, crucial years. Preachers are to be tried by a new kind of fire. These will be years of elimination. Already the day has passed when a man is accepted just because he is a preacher. It should never have been otherwise. He must now be a man, a man of God, an equipped, energetic, tactful, sympathetic man of God. A largely commercialized world will place its veto on the inefficient preacher, but this same world if it tolerates a preacher at all will support him. His temptation is going to be "efficiency for efficiency's sake" rather than to be a workman approved unto God. What opportunities of courage await him as he stands against the increasing tide of materialism, sometimes alone! What thrills of conquest as he witnesses the victory wrought by his gospel over the world,

the flesh and the devil, what experiences of friendship and fellowship abide him as he advances in his God-given task. He is no longer to be simply the pastor of a certain church, only as that provides him the best opportunity to be a messenger to the four quarters of the globe. His work is not only heaven crowned, it is earth wide. His is the international mind, the racial heart. He is to see as Jesus saw, to love as He loved, to work in the same field that He wrought. Never more true than today that the field is the world. To be uninformed or misinformed about other countries and races will be to the preacher's shame. He of all men must be a citizen of the universe for his citizenship is heavenly. He is a citizen of this **new** world, new, only in the sense of its untouched problems, tasks, and possibilities. New because it is old and weary with sin and misery and suffering which await the transforming power of the everlasting Gospel; new, because it is a vital part of that new heaven and new earth wherein is to dwell righteousness.

FACING THE FUTURE.*

Ryland Knight, Th.D., D.D.

Through the past five years the world has been experiencing the horrible nightmare of a terrific war. It was fought at tremendous cost of money and manhood, and of much else that civilization held dear. Now that peace has come and men are facing the future believing that the world is entering upon a new era in its history it may be well to ask ourselves if out of this tragic experience of war there may not have emerged certain lessons which, learned in such a school and at so great a price, we would do well to treasure and to carry with us into a new day that is ahead. What are some of the lessons which have come to us out of this war experience?

First of all there has come to us the consciousness that **the world is one.** Five years ago the United States boasted of its isolation. We felt that the problems and perils of the rest of the world concerned us very little. Geographically and traditionally we were separated from most of the vexing world problems. When in June, 1914, Arch-Duke Ferdinand was assassinated in Bosnia by a Serb that fact was scarcely mentioned in the newspapers of the United States, and if mentioned was speedily forgotten by those who read it. What did it matter to us? I happened to be in San Francisco when the war broke out and I recall seeing crowds of men born in European countries who surged the streets. I noticed with detached, casual interest how tense they were. But it was of no vital concern to me. I could not realize then, as none of us realized, that the events transpiring across the ocean were of vital interest to us, and that because of those events the day was hastening when our sons would

*(Alumni Address Southern Baptist Theological Seminary Commencement, June, 1919.)

be called to give up their lives on the battle-fields of France and our food and our fortunes would be seriously affected as we were drawn into the vortex of this enormous conflict. We came to learn in this war that the events that transpired across the ocean were vitally related to our homes, our families and our prosperity.

Out of the war then there has emerged this truth, that the world is one. No spot on earth is far away any more. One of the most vital problems of every American citizen today is what is being done and thought and purposed by Japan on the other side of the globe. The life of every nation in the world is related to ours. Foreign missions we know no more, because there is no place for it. Each nation, even the most remote, is so near a neighbor that our land will be darkened by the shadow of its ignorance and selfishness and greed unless we give them the light and liberty and everlasting gospel in which we rejoice.

This then the war has taught us, that the world is one, that each community is related to all the rest of the world, that the merchant in the little country store, the teacher in the rural school, the humble citizen at some cross-roads are citizens of the world, who must think world thoughts. Each individual everywhere is a wireless station whose radiations reach out into the life of the world.

This conception is the Christ conception. He first was a citizen of the world. He first thought in terms that were not provincial or tribal, but wide as humanity. He first proclaimed a God who loved the whole world. He first launched a religion whose mission was unto the uttermost parts of the earth. At the school of Mars there has been beaten into us the lesson which the Prince of Peace taught long ago, the world is one.

Another lesson which emerges from the chaos of war is **the spirit of sacrifice for a great cause.** Such a spirit was markedly lacking in our land in the days before the war. We were growing soft and indulgent or else we

were growing hard and grasping. We were measuring life in terms of material gain and of material pleasure. In us there was being fulfilled the word of the Psalmist, "He gave them their hearts' desire and sent leanness into their souls." We gloried in our material prosperity and rejoiced in the luxury that came in its train. Our ideals were languishing while our purses were growing full.

A striking commentary on our mental attitude, an attitude which we now view with shame, may be discovered by reading the files of our daily press during 1915. The world was in anguish. Freedom was fighting for its life. The hope of humanity was in the issue. Belgium was ravished and France was being bled white. And in the midst of this world anguish our papers in their news columns and in their editorials boasted that the financial center of the world had moved across the seas and that New York City was now the great money market of the world. That awful war in which freedom was fighting for its life meant for us in those days that we could sell food and munitions to other nations at exorbitant prices and grow rich out of the heart anguish of humanity. Our interest in the war was measured by what we got and not by what we gave.

Let us thank God that the soul of the nation awoke. Let us thank God that the war did not leave us in such an attitude. Let us rejoice that there came to us the vision of our privilege of sharing in the mighty conflict in behalf of humanity. Let us be glad that there came to us the consciousness that it was ours when such mighty issues were at stake to sacrifice and to serve. You will recall that after we entered the war Secretary Lane said at Atlantic City, "We have come to the day of a new philosophy. We have been measuring men by what they had. Hereafter we shall not measure men by what they have but by what they give." That new philosophy of Secretary Lane's became the philosophy of our country. We rejoiced to sacrifice for a great

cause. We caught the spirit of the soldier boy of France who when some one came upon him lying in a hospital and sympathized with him that he had lost his arm in the battle, replied "I did not lose it, I gave it for France."

It has been my privilege to talk to some of those fathers and mothers who wear a gold star in their hearts, men and women whose sons made the supreme sacrifice on the battle-field, and I have found in them not only a sense of loss and sorrow, but surmounting and transfiguring that a certain spiritual exaltation that it had been theirs to make such a glorious contribution to the cause of humanity.

"I have a gold star on my breast,
A star of strife, a star of rest;
It marks a sword-thrust through my heart,
It tells of glory and of pain,
Of bitter loss and wondrous gain,
Of youth that played the hero's part."

This also I need scarcely remind you is the conception of Jesus Christ. The "new philosophy" of Secretary Lane is but an echo of the great Teacher of the Galilean Lake. Long ago He said, "Whosoever will be great among you shall be your minister: and whosoever of you will be the chieftest shall be servant of all." Christianity proclaims as a central truth that if a cause is vital enough it is worth while for the Son of God Himself to die on the cross to further that cause. The spirit of Christianity is not the spirit of littleness and selfishness, but the spirit of heroic giving and of unmeasured sacrifice for the sake of a worth while cause.

A noble army, men and boys, the matron and the maid
Around the Saviour's throne—rejoice in robes of light arrayed:

They climbed the steep ascent of heaven through peril,
toil and pain:

O God, to us may grace be given to follow in their train!

The third lesson which comes to us from the war is the recognition of **the necessity for the standards of Jesus**; the consciousness of the fact that He and He alone is able to deliver us from another such catastrophe as that which through these five years has befallen the world. War is the collapse of civilization. In these recent months we have learned to our astonishment that a civilization built on culture, art, genius, financial prosperity, is not a permanent civilization. If civilization were permanent built on cannon, then Germany was the leader in the vanguard of civilization, because no army was more efficient than hers. If civilization built on commerce were a permanent civilization then Germany was the world's teacher, because commercially she stood at the front. If civilization built on culture could endure then Germany was the world's savior, because she was the leader in culture and five years ago the world sat at her feet and recognized her as supreme in matters of education. But because civilization built on cannon and commerce and culture could not last, because these and these alone were not sufficient Germany was branded as the lost leader and the betrayer of humanity. That was a striking word which the president of one of our largest universities, Nicholas Murray Butler, said recently at the University Club in New York City: "We have to confess ourselves mistaken and disappointed. We have said if we could place a free grammar school in the convenient reach of every child, a college and the university for those prepared for their advantages, we would solve the problem of civilization. We discovered by recent events that we were mistaken. We have found that men do not do what they are taught and what they know they ought to do, but they do what they want to do. We may train a man's mind to the uttermost efficiency and still leave the man enslaved to his passions, appetite and ambitions." The war has taught us that the civilization which is to endure may not be built on cannon or commerce or culture, but must be built on Christ.

There are in the world today two principles. The first is the law of the jungle. Its teaching is that might makes right, that to the sharpest claw and the cruelest fang belongs the supremacy of the jungle, that the weak has no rights which the strong need respect, that might gives the right to prey. This law of the jungle is the recognized principle wherever force works its will in disregard of justice. Wherever a great nation wrongs a weak nation, wherever a lawless mob lynches an individual, wherever a ruthless employer forces his way because he has the power, wherever employees make demands beyond the measure of justice because the whip hand has come to them, wherever might not right and force rather than equity is the deciding factor, there is the rule of the jungle.

Over against the law of the jungle is the law of Jesus, which is the law of justice and of brotherhood. He proclaimed the Golden Rule, "As ye would that men should do to you do ye even so to them." It was His principle that the strong ought to bear the infirmities of the weak. He measured success not by the power to prey, but by the power to serve.

This ideal of Jesus, this principle of justice and equity and brotherhood for strong and weak alike is the only enduring basis upon which international relationship may be builded. It is the only foundation for a permanent civilization. If you will read carefully the matchless state papers of Woodrow Wilson concerning our part in the war and in the making of peace you will find that the high idealism which has marked his words was learned from the New Testament, and that it has been his purpose to translate the teaching of the Sermon on the Mount into terms of international diplomacy. I believe it was his desire to sit at the peace table in order to say those words and to give that counsel which would interpret the principles of Jesus, and that the peace terms as at last devised and the League of Nations therein in-

corporated was his endeavor to establish the international relationship of this new era upon the truths which Jesus taught for the guidance and the light of the world.

Out of these three lessons, the consciousness that the world is one, the spirit of sacrifice for a great cause, the recognition of the necessity for the standards of Jesus, there comes to us **the imperial call to service**. Some one has well said that last year we were asked to conserve our material resources for the wellbeing of humanity and that this year we are called upon to conserve our moral and spiritual resources for the wellbeing of humanity. I need scarcely remind you how quickly this nation responded to the appeal last year, with what unexampled unanimity the American people deprived themselves of food and fuel in order that they might be used across the seas and gave lavishly of their money to aid the cause for which their soldiers had gone out. "Help win the war" was an appeal to which the deaf ear was rarely turned.

But if it was vital that we conserve our material resources last year it is even more vital that we shall now conserve our moral and spiritual resources in so far as the spiritual is more vital than the material. To recognize the worth of the material and to be blind to the need for the spiritual is to class oneself with that Germany which went out boasting of the might of its armies and of its animal super-men, sacrificing its soul for the sake of material gain; while to recognize the supreme value of the spiritual is to stand with little Belgium, which for the sake of honor and moral integrity laid herself down to be trampled on by the brutal forces of Germany, sacrificing all save her soul.

A little kingdom kept its word,
And dying, cried across the night,
Hear, O earth, we chose the right.

And the earth has heard, and stood with uncovered head
before that little kingdom which taught the world afresh
the supremacy of the spiritual.

The eleventh of last November marked the end of the war. For the winning of that war we had marshalled all our forces and strained every nerve. There has been a tendency since that day to feel somewhat that the task was accomplished and that we might rest on our laurels. And yet however glorious the achievement prior to last November there lie gigantic and unfulfilled tasks ahead of us. Our army and the armies of our allies succeeded in breaking down forever the old order. We may reasonably predict that the world will never see another autocrat. The day of absolutism is ended. The old order changeth, giving place to the new. But what the new order shall be, what its purpose and spirit shall be is as yet undetermined. There comes to us today therefore the clarion call that we shall quit us like men and be strong for the sake of carrying on to completion the tasks begun by our fighting men and of making this new era which they have given us worthy of the price they paid.

One of our weekly magazines had recently a cartoon entitled "Back to the Grind." On one side of the cartoon there stood the Red Cross office, the headquarters of the Army and Navy Comforts League, the various places where the women of our land rendered such valiant service for the war, and these were closed. On the other side of the picture were open the various palaces of pleasure, and a stream of women were going from the closed places of service to the open halls of pleasure. I wonder if such a picture will be true. I wonder if that superb spirit of service will die and those who took their places to help in this great conflict will go back to idleness and indulgence. Is there not a challenge to the church to bring to those who served so well either at the battle front or at home **a new vision of the tasks that lie ahead** and the service they still may render?

For there are tasks ahead. The Bolsheviks who would substitute the autocracy of the class for the autocracy of the kaiser and who would disregard justice in the interests of the group are lifting their voices not only

across the seas but in our own fair land. In one of the Western states a Bolshevist leader recently said of our own great country: "Your liberty is a lie, your democracy is a lie, your God is a lie." There was this element of truth in what he said, that our liberty and our democracy are the outgrowth of our religion and if we fail to conserve our moral and spiritual forces, if we permit ourselves to become crass and material, selfish and self-indulgent, we shall find that liberty and democracy and religion will go down together. Democracy can only flourish in a land of high ideals dedicated to principles of justice and right. Leslie's Weekly recently closed an editorial with these words: "We are in the midst of the world's upheaval, but we are not ready to pull down the golden cross of the Crusaders and hoist the red rag of the anarchists. Not yet!

O cross that liftest up my head,
I dare not ask to fly from thee."

The very restlessness in our own land and in other lands, caused in part at least by the breaking down of old traditions and established usages, has in it a large element of opportunity. We have chaos, but a chaos which may be rebuilt into an order in which Jesus of Nazareth is supreme. We have unsettled conditions, but we are permitted not only to hope for but to strive for a new day which shall have in it more of justice and opportunity, progress toward the new earth wherein dwelleth righteousness. Men who have been in shackles are now free and it is our privilege to instruct them in the true meaning of freedom, that they use not their liberty as an occasion to the flesh but by love serve one another. Men are stumbling because they are groping for the light which shall make the life of tomorrow, the life for which men fought and sacrificed, rich and full and satisfying. That in their groping they are selfish, perverse, short-sighted, is a challenge to us that we shall show them a better way. What age in all of history has called out

to the followers of the Christ more loudly that we should live soberly, righteously and godly in this present world, that we should fulfill the mission of the Master and be the saving salt by which the nations may be healed and the shining light in which men may rejoice as they find the way of life.

Nor is the door of service shut in the face of any one of us. It has been wisely said that it is harder to live largely and richly in a little town than to go across the sea. Our little towns, our isolated communities, our backward sections, with their prejudices and their lack of vision, call to some of us to live in them with so much of the strength, the sanity and the spirit of Jesus, that they may be stirred to higher ideals and richer lives. Our teeming cities, restless and filled with pitfalls, must be through us a savor of life unto life, or because of our failure a savor of death unto death to the shepherdless multitudes who throng their streets. The nations of the world who are turning eyes of pathetic hope toward America invite us to give them the gospel of that Christ whose teachings make liberty possible, and whose cross is the hope of humanity.

This day is a day of great opportunity for the church, a day which should deeply stir the heart of every young man who has been called into the ministry. It is a day restless, as it has broken with the past, stumbling as it faces the untried future. It is a day when the world needs Jesus of Nazareth, who can lay his hand upon our problems and upon our perplexities and who alone is able to bring healing to the nations and help to all mankind. In a marvelous sense this is the day of Jesus Christ.

“In the years that have been I have bound man closer
to man

And closer woman to woman,
And the stranger hath seen in a stranger his brother at
last

And a sister in eyes that were strange;

In the years that shall be I will bind nation to nation;
And shore unto shore," said our God,
'Lo I am the burster of bonds and the breaker of barriers,
I am he that shall free,' said the Lord.
'For the lingering battle, the contest of ages is ending,
And victory followeth me.' "

Nashville, Tenn.

OUR LORD'S RESURRECTION AND HIMSELF.

W. E. Henry, D.D.

Every life possesses a unity and a constant movement all its own. All we know combines to assure us that however long a life may be, however varying may be the incidents entering into it, that life continues to be the same life and persistently shows motion in some direction. Consequently no incident in a life can be altogether unimportant to that life or to other lives.

This truth which so certainly holds with respect to life prior to what we call death, doubtless holds, also, with respect to that life which follows death. Then, too, every life will be a unity and a progression, and every incident will be significant to the individual himself and to those associated with him.

The Man Christ Jesus was not exempt from the great laws which govern all men. He grew "in wisdom and stature, and in favor with God and men."¹ He became weary and hungry, waxed indignant, shed tears, marvelled, suffered and died as other men. His life was one and progressive. Incidents in life signified something to Him as they do to us. In Him, however, there occurred no backward step as so often happens with us. In His life movement was always a progression and never a retrogression. In Him humanity developed along right lines.

In this article we shall seek to discover as far as possible what the resurrection accomplished with respect to the Lord Himself. The task is, of course, beset with difficulties, but there need not be failure to glean truth. And if we have in any real sense grasped the emphasis laid upon this event in the New Testament writings, it will occasion no surprise if we find that the consequences of the resurrection for our Lord Himself were far-reaching

¹Lk. 2:52.

and of the greatest importance, although but little recognized in general Christian thought.

1. Clearing the Way.

But first of all it seems necessary to clear the way a little. Just what happened when the "Word became flesh" and the Son of God began His life among men? What all was included in that "emptying" of Himself which Paul tells us marked His coming into the world? Evidently we can never be sure that we have reached a correct reply to these questions. The process lies entirely outside the region of present human experience. Yet it is hardly possible for us to think with satisfaction concerning many other things without formulating for ourselves some view as to what was involved for Christ in the incarnation. The resurrection and the incarnation are so closely related that regard for the truth and fairness to the reader seem to demand at this point a brief statement of the view of this divine process which obtains in this discussion.

The incarnation is here understood to mean such an emptying on the part of God's Son of all that belonged to Him in the preincarnate state as made it possible for Him to become perfectly identified with humanity, and to share as a man in all the stages of ordinary human development. He did not surrender His deity, but He did become man, and grew into the consciousness of His power and of His life work as other men. Christ was not both God and man, an inconceivable being with two personalities within Him, but the God-man, with one personality in which was included in perfect union essential deity and essential humanity. He was not a man developing into God, but rather God developing as a man. "In Christ's life and work," says Forsyth, "we have that divine mobility in which the living Son eternally was—we have that coming historically, and psychologically, and ethically to be. He came to be what He always vitally was

....He moved by His history to a supernal world that He moved in by His nature. We have that divine Son, by whose agency the world of souls was made, not now creating another soul for His purpose, but Himself becoming such a soul. Surely....if He had it in Him to make souls in the divine image it was in Him to become one."²

Again, another matter of considerable importance throughout this discussion, and especially requiring a word just here, is the relation of the resurrection to the ascension and the exaltation of our Lord. It is a noticeable fact that the ascension does not bulk large in the New Testament as an independent event. In Matthew's Gospel it is not mentioned at all. In Mark's it is barely mentioned in the 19th verse of the last chapter—a part of those closing verses which many scholars insist are not a part of the original Gospel. If Westcott and Hort are right in regarding the last five words of Luke 24:51 as an early interpolation, then the third Gospel contains no certain reference to the ascension. In the fourth Gospel there are explicit references to the ascension but no narrative of the event. The opening verses of the Acts present the event in detail. In the Epistles Christ is thought of as "seated at the right hand of God," and while they certainly involve the ascension they rarely refer directly to it. Thus it becomes evident that this event "is not separately emphasized in the New Testament as distinct from the resurrection, or from that state of exaltation to which it was the solemn entrance." And yet it would be entirely incorrect to say that the ascension is identified with either the resurrection or that state of exaltation in which the Christ now is. Resurrection, ascension and sitting at God's right hand are not interchangeable terms. In short, the ascension appears to be regarded in the New Testament as "no more than a point of transition," with no theological significance distinguishable from that of the resurrection and the exaltation of Christ.

²"The Person and Place of Jesus Christ," p. 338.

The exalted state of our Lord is one step further removed from the resurrection than the ascension. As noted above the writers of the Epistles thought of Him as "seated at the right hand of God." But while His exaltation was unmistakably set forth in apostolic preaching, it did not receive the stress laid upon the resurrection. Nor does it seem to have been looked upon as of equal theological import. Ellicott says, "The preaching of the apostles was preeminently the **resurrection** of Christ, as that which included in it everything besides."³ In fact, the stress is laid so constantly and so almost exclusively throughout the New Testament upon the resurrection that we can hardly fall short of regarding it as "that one great victory over sin and death that made every minor conquest over earthly relations a matter of certain and inevitable sequence."⁴

Now having reached a common level of thought concerning Him who was raised up, and concerning the relation of the ascension and the exaltation of Christ to His resurrection, we are ready to consider the effect of this last event upon our Lord's person and work.

2. The Resurrection and Christ's Person.

Considered with respect to our Lord's person, the resurrection is seen to have contributed (1) to the **perfecting of His humanity**. We have already noted that when the Lord came to redeem the world a union was effected between humanity and deity. The Christ was born "of the seed of David according to the flesh."⁵ Because "the children are sharers in flesh and blood, He also Himself in like manner partook of the same."⁶ And the union thus formed between the human and the divine was not for a time only. It still continues, and will continue at least until the close of this present dispensation. Other-

³"Life of Christ," p. 338, note 1.

⁴Id. p. 338.

⁵Rom. 1:3.

⁶Heb. 2:14.

wise Paul's statement could not be true that God "hath appointed a day in the which He will judge the world in righteousness by the man whom He hath ordained; whereof He hath given assurance unto all men, in that He hath raised Him from the dead." Nor does revelation afford any ground for believing this union of humanity with deity in the person of the Son will ever cease. It has evidently become "indissoluble and eternal," His humanity now being "coeternal to His divinity." The resurrection, then, cannot be regarded as the casting off of Christ's humanity, but must be looked upon as the entrance of that humanity upon a new stage of existence.

The chief source of knowledge concerning the resurrection body of our Lord is the history of the forty days intervening between His resurrection and the ascension. Study of this source has led to the presentation of four different views. Some hold that He rose with His natural body simply reanimated like the body of Jairus' daughter, or the widow of Nain's son, all change towards a spiritual body being effected at the ascension. Others insist upon a modification of this view, believing that while He rose with His "natural body," this gradually underwent during the forty days a process of transformation into His spiritual body with which He ascended. A third view is that His resurrection body, while the same as that laid in the tomb, was from the moment of His rising "endued with new powers, properties, and attributes." Still others believe that the resurrection body was ethereal, something between matter and spirit.

The first of these views is manifestly unable to include all the facts revealed, and it would seem a combination of the compatible elements of the second and third would harmonize better with the strange phenomena of the forty days than any one view taken separately. But such a state of change is impossible of proof. It lies beyond our experience, and the voice of revelation is silent except as to facts from which inference should never be dogmatic.

⁷Acts 17:31.

But while admitting that the precise state of Christ's body during the forty days must remain undetermined, the sphere of that indeterminateness should not pass unrecognized. There are doubtless very few indeed today who believe that the body with which our Lord rose was in no wise different from that laid in the tomb three days before. Practically all admit that it was different, and that this difference raised it far above the latter. The exact point which cannot be determined is the degree of difference.

But a man is more than a mere body. If Christ continues in any real sense a "man," His humanity must include more than simply a body, however refined that may be. We must go on, therefore, to ask this further question, what effect had the resurrection on these other elements essential to a real humanity? To this no trustworthy reply can be given except in a limited and general way. Conjecture would be easy and might be interesting, but could hardly be profitable. Plain statements in the Scriptures are wanting.. We must be content to remain in ignorance here except as inference may safely be made from what is revealed concerning Christ's present state. What we know of this is sufficient to assure us that, as to the body, so also to all that was essential to His humanity, the resurrection of Christ contributed somewhat towards perfection. While, therefore, we cannot say with Prof. Milligan, that "His resurrection was the perfecting in His person of a humanity which even our first parents had received only in rudimentary and initial, not its ultimate stage,"⁸ we can say that it contributed richly to the perfecting of such humanity.

"Then first humanity
Triumphant passed the crystal ports of light,
(Stupendous guest!) and seized eternal youth."

The man in Him became thenceforth better fitted to be the medium of an adequate manifestation of Himself,⁹

⁸"The Resurrection of Our Lord," p. 133.

⁹Jno. 21:1-14.

because it had moved forward in accordance with the universal law (for man), "Howbeit that is not first which is spiritual, but that which is natural; then that which is spiritual."¹⁰

But the resurrection did more for Christ's person than contribute to the perfecting of His humanity; it also (2) contributed to the **full investing of our Lord with Messianic dignity and divine glory**. Godet maintains that at the resurrection "Jesus was restored and restored wholly to the position of the Son of God, which He had renounced on becoming incarnate." But in what sense, it may be asked, did the Word renounce His sonship with the Father on becoming incarnate? Was not Jesus truly God's Son even during His humiliation, as truly so as at any subsequent period of His existence? We dare not regard the resurrection as adding anything to the reality of His sonship, or as adding anything to the reality of His humanity. It must be regarded, however, as contributing to the full taking on of all that pertained to His sonship as it contributed to the full development of His humanity. Peter declares this on the day of Pentecost: "This Jesus did God raise up, whereof we all are witnesses. Being therefore by the right hand of God exalted, and having received of the Father the promise of the Holy Spirit, He hath poured forth this which ye see and hear. . . . Let all the house of Israel therefore know assuredly, that God hath made Him both Lord and Christ, this Jesus whom ye crucified."¹¹ And lest the force of these words be underrated, attention should be called to the fact that emphasis is not here laid upon the ascension or exaltation, but upon the resurrection. The "therefore" of verse 33 makes it clear that the exaltation of Christ is though of not as in itself of prime importance, but "as a necessary consequent of the resurrection." Paul's testimony is to the same effect. In Romans 1:4 he declares that "Jesus was instated as the Son of God

¹⁰1 Cor. 15:46.

¹¹Acts 2:32, 33, 36.

with power, according to the Spirit of Holiness, by the resurrection of the dead." Paul does not mean, of course, that the resurrection made Jesus the Son of God. He was already God's Son before the foundations of the world were laid. It was as such that He was sent into the world.¹² When He became a man, however, He "emptied Himself" of much that had been His.¹³ And as a consequence of this humiliation there was needed some fact by means of which he should receive "instating into the rank and dignity of His divine Sonship; whereby also, as its necessary consequence with a view to the knowledge and conviction of men" he should be "legitimately established as the Son."¹⁴ Such fact, accomplishing in full the mighty purposes of God, was the resurrection. Wrought through the majesty of the Father, it "was the actual introduction of Christ into the full possession of divine Sonship so far as thereto belonged, not only the **inner** of a holy, spiritual essence, but also the **outer** of an existence in power and heavenly glory."¹⁵

Whatever, therefore, may be the opinion held as to Christ's state during the forty days, or as to what was accomplished for Him by the ascension and the exaltation, the very least that can be said must include the admission that the resurrection was at least a mighty step forward in the removal of those limitations which pertained to the state of His "kenosis," and of the taking on of those privileges which pertain to His state as "Lord of all." But it is very difficult to believe that the untrammelled mind can be satisfied with this minimum admission. Ordinary spiritual discernment will hardly suffer one to stop short of the firm conviction that the resurrection, wrought through the majesty of the Father, was "the great divine act, which . . . powerfully instated the Son in the Son's positions and dignities," that the rising from the dead

¹²Rom. 8:3; Gal. 4:4.

¹³Phil. 2:7.

¹⁴Meyer, Commentary, in loco.

¹⁵Bruce, "Apologetics," p. 404.

was above all other events that which perfected our Lord in dignity and divine glory.

3. The Resurrection and Christ's Work.

Passing now from the consideration of the bearing of the resurrection upon our Lord's person to ascertain its relation to His work, we notice that (1) it **made possible the completion of His work.** Our Lord indeed cried upon the cross, "It is finished." But evidently this was not spoken of all His work for the salvation of men. In fact, it can be understood only of "His groans and tears, and agonies and cries; His submission to the pains and sufferings and death appointed for Him; His struggle with the world and its prince."¹⁶ These were finished, but not all of that mighty work which He had covenanted with the Father to perform for men.

No analysis of our Lord's work is likely to prove uniformly acceptable. One of the most comprehensive and satisfactory, however, is that which recognizes Him as exercising the functions of prophet, priest and king. As prophet He spoke forth the truth of God to men. As priest, through the eternal Spirit, He offered Himself to, and intercedes with, God for men. As king He rules over, and ministers to, men in the Father's stead. And whether we trace His work as prophet, priest or king we shall find its completion lying after the resurrection and made possible by it.

In His last discourse Christ taught plainly that His work as prophet was to be continued and completed after His death.¹⁷ "These things have I spoken unto you in dark sayings: the hour cometh, when I shall no more speak unto you in dark sayings, but shall tell you plainly of the Father."¹⁸ It may be possible, with a little show of reason, to contend that these words must be limited to the period between the resurrection and the ascension,

¹⁶Milligan, "The Resurrection of Our Lord," p. 141.

¹⁷Jno. 14-16.

¹⁸Jno. 16:25.

during which the risen Lord was from time to time "appearing to His disciples" and "speaking the things concerning the kingdom of God." Yet it is almost uniformly held that Christ had in mind the period which began with the descent of the Holy Spirit on the day of Pentecost and will continue till His return at the last day, and that He means to claim the teaching of the Holy Spirit as in every sense His own teaching. For present purposes, however, we need not contend for either view. To accept the one or the other is to admit that our Lord's work as prophet was to be continued and completed after His death, and such continuance and completion were made possible only by His triumph over death and the grave.

But the resurrection did more towards the completion of Christ's work as prophet than simply make possible further activity as teacher. It also added to the completeness of His prophetic message. This included not only His death but also His resurrection. And while this last event had been foretold, few details had been given as to its attendant circumstances or as to its significance. So far as the resurrection entered, Christ's message had doubtless never been clothed with such completeness as when reviewed on the way to Emmaus¹⁹ or in the Jerusalem chamber.²⁰ Then the facts were all in, and the message could be made clear and complete. Certain it is that under the tutelage of the Spirit, whom most will rightly regard as continuing in Christ's stead the work of teaching which He had begun, the significance of the resurrection was broadened vastly beyond the apparent meaning of any declaration concerning it recorded in the Gospels.

The resurrection also made possible the completion of Christ's priestly work. A very essential part of this is that blessed intercession, which, while begun upon the earth,²¹ is continued in all its fullness at the right hand of the Father in heaven and constitutes an eternal guaranty of our salvation. It is "because he abideth forever, hath

¹⁹Lk. 24:26.

²⁰Id. 24:44.

²¹Id. 22:32.

his priesthood unchangeable," "ever liveth to make intercession" for us, that "he is able to save to the uttermost them that draw near unto God through Him."²² And He thus "abideth forever" through the resurrection from the dead.

Moreover, our Lord's expiatory work was not finished until after the resurrection. This is unmistakably set forth in the Epistle to the Hebrews.²³ According to the ancient ritual, the ceremonies of the great day of Atonement culminated with the entrance of the highpriest within the vail, and the sprinkling of the blood upon the mercy-seat. Likewise, also, in the real work of the atonement, of which this was the type, "Christ, having come as the high priest of the good things to come, through the greater and more perfect tabernacle, not made with hands, (that is, not of this creation), and not through the blood of goats and calves but through his own blood, entered once for all into the holy places, obtaining eternal redemption."²⁴ And thus, "having offered one sacrifice for sins, forever sat down at the right hand of God; from henceforth waiting until His enemies be made His footstool."²⁵

Again, similar remarks apply to our Lord's kingly work. Remarkable indications of His kingly character occasionally gleamed forth in His earthly career. Wind, sea, disease, demons obeyed His voice, and before Pontius Pilate He plainly owned His royalty. Yet even the present time does not behold the completeness of His kingship. All things are to be put "in subjection under His feet," "but now we see not yet all things subjected to Him."²⁶ The complete manifestation of the Lord's authority is yet future, and it is only as He passed through death to life by the resurrection that this consummation of His kingly power is to be attained.

²²Heb. 7:24, 25.

²³Chapters 9 and 10.

²⁴9:11, 12.

²⁵10:12, 13. A fuller discussion of the relation of the resurrection to Christ's work of expiation will appear later.

²⁶Heb. 2:8.

(2) It is the **crowning manifestation of the divine approbation of our Lord's earthly career.** Olshausen observes that the entire Christology of Paul is to be found in Eph. 1:20-23, Phil. 2:6-11 and Col. 1:14-19. In the second of these passages the high exaltation of Christ is declared to be a consequence of His willing acceptance of humiliation and suffering. "Who, existing in the form of God, counted not the being on an equality with God a thing to be grasped, but emptied himself, taking the form of a servant, being made in the likeness of men; and being found in fashion as a man, he humbled himself, becoming obedient even unto death, yea, the death of the cross. Wherefore²⁷ also God highly exalted him, and gave unto him the name which is above every name." That is, the whole career of the Son is so well pleasing in the Father's sight as to call forth this striking seal of His approval. In the first, the resurrection is at least co-ordinately associated with the seating at God's right hand as a manifestation of that "might of his strength" which placed Christ "far above" all else. Paul prayed that the Ephesians might know "the exceeding greatness of his power to usward who believe, according to that working of the strength of his might which he wrought in Christ, when he raised him from the dead, and made him to sit at his right hand in the heavenly places, far above all rule, and authority, and power, and dominion, and every name that is named, not only in this world, but also in that which is to come." And in the third, this pre-eminence in all things is declared to be the divine purpose accomplished in making Him "the beginning", "the first born from the dead". "And he is the head of the body, the church: who is the beginning, the first born from the dead; that in all things he might have the pre-eminence."²⁸ These latter passages, considered in connection with Rom. 1:4, can leave no doubt that in the approbative exaltation of Phil. 2:6-11 the resurrection held the chief place. Nor may it be forgotten that the tenor of the whole New Testament is to present this conquest

²⁷Greek *διό* ²⁸Greek *iv'a*

of death and the grave as the chief element of that divine justification²⁹ of Jesus, that omnipotent reversal of human judgment, which gave Him whom the world had scorned, placed at its bar as a malefactor and blasphemer, and nailed to the cross, to be head over all things. According to the counsels of eternity, the third morning after the crucifixion brought the supreme moment for the expression of the Father's approval of the earthly ministrations of His Son. All had been done in harmony with His will, and the heavenly messenger left in the open tomb an open declaration that He was satisfied.

Perhaps yet another step should be taken here. This divine approval of our Lord's career of which the resurrection is the crowning manifestation, while at first hand an approval of the manner in which the work was done, is in essence also an approval of the object of that work. And if the resurrection attests the Father's approval both of the object of the Son's work and of the manner in which it was accomplished, it constitutes also a testimony to its adequacy. That is, the fact that God raised Christ from the dead is a proof that the Son's work so far had fully met the Father's requirements.

A writer of profound spiritual insight has said, "Christianity in its last analysis consists of two elements, a person and a fact—Jesus and the resurrection."³⁰ His words are in perfect accord with the New Testament conception. But how inseparable are the two. The person may be central, but just as the fact could not have been apart from the unique person, so the person could not be apart from the unique fact. Whether considered as to being, or as to outcome of being, work, the Christ of Christianity is impossible without the aid of the resurrection. A Christology which does not recognize the bearing of this fact upon our Lord is thereby not only emasculated but falsified. The message of the Church must ever be that of Paul, the good news of "Jesus and the resurrection".³¹

²⁹1 Tim. 3:16.

³⁰Henry G. Weston, *Bibliotheca Sacra*, October, 1900, p. 696.

³¹Acts 17:18.

THE EFFECT OF THE NAPOLEONIC WARS ON GREAT BRITAIN.

By William W. Everts.

When Great Britain engaged in war with Napoleon, she was mistress of the seven seas, having taken South Africa from Holland, the West Indies from Spain, and the East Indies and Canada from France. By the invention of the spinning-mule by Crompton, and of the spinning jenny by Hargreaves, and of the power-loom by Cartwright, and of the water-frame by Arkwright, and of the steam engine by Watt, she had become the workshop of the world, and, under Pitt's economies, the most prosperous country on the earth. Her imports had increased in ten years from ten million to nineteen million pounds sterling, and her exports from thirteen million to twenty-five million pounds. But to keep the monopoly of foreign trade it was thought necessary to command cheap labor, in order to produce goods cheaply: therefore apprentices were multiplied, and women were called to work, all to depress the wages of men. Besides, machines run by power, slowly but inevitably introduced an industrial revolution. Handlooms and home industries, which had been in use for centuries, were displaced by the hard discipline of the factory system. With the increase of wealth came the disposition to dispossess the village communities of the commons, where games had been played, where cattle had been pastured, and produce had been raised by the inhabitants. So the reduction in wages, and the enclosure of the commons, greatly distressed the poor. "Give us back our commons," they said, "and we will do without relief." However, when the centennial of the glorious revolution of 1688 was celebrated, the people were still deceived into believing that they were living under the best government on earth.

Pitt boasted that the laws of England afford equal security and protection to high and low, to the rich and the poor. Indeed, Montesquieu and Voltaire had been holding up the Government of England as a model for France to follow. It was a limited monarchy, limited by the nobility, for both Tories and Whigs were aristocrats. The land-owners ruled the land: they ruled their seats in the House of Lords, and through their representatives in the House of Commons, from the three hundred and seven boroughs which they controlled. They ruled through the clergy, whom they patronized with their advowsons and livings. They ruled through the army and navy and all civil offices, of which they had the disposal. The government was Christian. No Jew had a place in it. It was Protestant. No Roman Catholic had a share in it. It was Episcopalian. No Dissenter could hold office. The Government was a privileged oligarchy, an exclusive monopoly, supported by the East India Company, the landlords, and the bishops. The middle and lower classes were taught, not to rule, but to obey. Bishop Horsley said, "I do not know what the mass of the people in any country have to do with the laws but to obey them." In Scotland there had been an uprising for a few years against the appointment of pastors. The people of Glasgow complained that "unless patronage was abolished, the people would lose all notion of liberty. The constitution of the church is republican, but patronage breathes the spirit of absolutism." The miners and operatives were left to the care of the Non-Conformists. The rectors had no patience with emotional or enthusiastic preaching, and in the days of Robert Hall and Rowland Hill, of Thomas Chalmers and Edward Irving, no great preachers appeared among them. Theirs was a religion of form and dress and manners, in which they easily excelled. The bishops of that day, in their pastoral charges, dealt generally in denunciation of Dissenters and the Evangelicals. There was a Society for the Promotion of Christian

Knowledge, but their cheapest Bibles cost five shillings sixpence, and in 1787 they could not furnish more than five hundred copies to supply a great demand in Wales. Principal Robertson of Edinburgh University thought that the popular election of pastors would lead to rioting. "If you open the gate of novelty," he said, "who will shut it?" The Moderate or Erastian party was then in control of the churches there. The ministers sought the favor of their patrons, the educated and governing classes.

In England a minister was not satisfied with one parish, but sought the income from several livings. He was often a non-resident rector—there were 6,311 of them in 1811—not even represented by a poor resident curate until the law of 1812 compelled a performance of that duty. The sacrament was usually celebrated only four times a year. The moral condition of the people is depicted in the novels of Charlotte Brontë. Walter Scott says that ballads were sung in the streets that were unfit to be heard, and that Mrs. Behn's lecherous novels were read aloud in parlors. Dr. Samuel Johnson advocated the public execution of criminals, on the double ground that it gratified the public and that the procession from the prison to the gallows was a support to the convict. In the year 1787 there were 97 executions for shop-lifting alone.

The French Revolution sent a thrill through the British nation. Its proclamation of the rights of man was popularized by Thomas Paine and by Godwin, and the disfranchised and downtrodden in England and Scotland looked up surprised and delighted at what had taken place across the Channel. The French States-General favored public schools, and sought the extermination of poverty and slavery, as well as of ignorance. They opened a new era with a new calendar from the year 1 of the French Republic. The Declaration of the Rights of Man was printed on a single page, but "that page outweighed whole libraries, and was worth more than armies." It

changed the course of history. It aroused a democratic movement that could not be stopped. The people took control in their own hands. Their first act had been the destruction of the Bastille, which despots had filled with the noblest heroes of France. Bastille after bastille of cruel oppression was swept away. Liberty, fraternity and equality were the glorious watchwords of 1789. The ill-gotten gains of bishop, noble and king were restored to the people from whom they had been taken. The people became citizens instead of serfs, rulers instead of subjects.

The most enlightened men of Great Britain joined in a chorus of praise of the Revolution. Robert Hall exclaimed, "The empire of darkness and of despair has been smitten with a stroke which has sounded through the universe." Burns compared the English to the French Revolution: "The recollection of that glorious struggle for freedom, associated with the glowing ideas of some other struggle of the same nature, not quite so ancient, roused my rhyming mania." In "A Man's a Man for a' That," he embodied not only the philosophy, but even the very words, of Thomas Paine. "Scot's Wha' Ha' Wi' Wallace Bled" starts from the same emotion. Wordsworth was in France in 1791. "Bliss was it in that dawn to be alive." Thus he hailed with delight a reform which promised a government of equal rights and individual worth. He went back to England a changed man. The promise of the French Revolution had for the time eclipsed his love of nature. It was the same influence that held the vacillating Coleridge in a human world. He composed an ode on the fall of the Bastille:

"Fallen is the oppressor, friendless, ghastly, low,
And my heart aches, though mercy struck the blow."

Years afterwards he recalls,—

"I blessed the paeans of delivered France,
And hung my head and wept at Britain's name."

Statesmen, too, like Burke and Mackintosh, Fox and Sheridan, lauded the first achievements of the Republic; and Pitt had just proposed to abolish the slave-trade and to reform Parliament, when the Reign of Terror occurred in 1793, and enthusiasm for the Republic suddenly turned to dread and aversion. All thought of political and social reform was abandoned for nearly forty years. During all those years of Tory reaction, there was but one large reform put through Parliament,—the abolition of the slave-trade in the year 1807. All thought of political reform was forbidden during the twenty years' war, so that the good people of Great Britain were shut up to moral reform. Many moral reforms were carried through during this period outside of Parliament.

Clapham was the home of a company of rich evangelical philanthropists of the Church of England. They were William Wilberforce, Henry Thornton, Zachary Macaulay, Thomas Buxton, and others. Wilberforce had been converted by Milner during a tour of the Continent in the year 1784. It was he who as a friend of Pitt in Parliament at length secured the abolition of the slave-trade. "His eloquence and courtesy, his perfect honesty, his courage and perseverance, had proved to be irresistible." Largely through the influence of these gentlemen of Clapham, religion became the fashion in England. Seldom before or since has it claimed so much attention there. It was largely a laymen's movement. Family life was purified. Family prayers were instituted. J. H. Newman, F. W. Faber and T. B. Macaulay were trained in this atmosphere. Though the leaders belonged to the Church of England, they worked together with "the three denominations." Indeed, Baring Gould traces the evangelical movement in the Church of England to the Scotch. In Scotland, Robert Haldane, also a man of wealth, was awakened from the sleep of spiritual death by the trumpet of the French Revolution. He read the writings of Burke, Mackintosh and Priestley, and looked to politics for the

improvement of human affairs. "I eagerly clutched at politics," he says, "as a pleasing speculation. As a fleeting phantom it eluded my grasp; but, missing the shadow, I caught the substance." The rest of his life was devoted to the propagation of the Gospel as a Baptist Evangelist. He sold his estate, and bought the Edinburgh Circus, and transformed it into a tabernacle. He went to France and Switzerland, and awakened Daubigne Gausson, Caesar Malan and Monod. His brother, James, of like spirit, refused permission to make a Christian settlement in India, started a Society for the Propagation of the Gospel at Home. It was this society which introduced the whole evangelical movement in Scotland.

In 1791 Thornton formed a society to introduce trade, industry and Christian knowledge into Sierra Leone. At a dinner at Thornton's in 1797 Wilberforce suggested the formation of a Church Missionary Society. It was a church society, but neither high church nor diocesan, because the peers and the prelates did not join it. Dr. Porteus said, "This whole missionary business grows from a democratic root." The same group of men founded the Religious Tract Society in 1799, which was followed by the British and Foreign Bible Society. They furnished Scriptures at half the cost price. When a carload of Bibles arrived in Wales, it was met by the peasants as the cart that carried the Ark of the Testimony had been welcomed by the ancient Israelites. The cheap repository tracts edited by their colaborer Hannah More were circulated by the million. The British and Foreign School Society, started in 1804, was another expression of the zeal of the Clapham men, who added to their labors, in 1809, the Society for the Conversion of the Jews, and in 1811 the Society for the Education of the Poor. Their power was not in their numbers, but in the societies which they organized. The writings of these men may be forgotten now, but their lives and deeds brighten a dark page of history.

But this, the best type of religion of that day, was still under the control of the philosophy of Locke, who looked upon property as the mainstay of the State. Therefore, Evangelicals and Methodists alike dwelt on the future rather than the present welfare of the poor. They favored the Government in its efforts to prevent the laboring classes from bettering their condition. They taught obedience to authority, and resignation to poverty, without thinking that workers have rights as well as employers, or that Government should look after the many rather than the few. They cared for the black slaves in the West Indies, while they neglected the white slaves in Lancashire. In the year 1819, at a great Methodist meeting at Hunslet Moor, a resolution was passed which "deeply deplored the religious and moral state of the world, especially of the Pagans, Mohammedans, and Jews."

While the well-to-do classes were busy with these many reforms, the poorer classes were suffering from the high cost of living caused by the war. Wheat that had brought forty-three shillings a quarter in 1792 could not be had in 1795 for less than seventy-five shillings, and soon it averaged ninety-eight shillings till 1820. In 1800 wages purchased only one-half of the provisions they had equalled ten years before. The Government placed restrictions on the use of grain by brewers, and commandeered neutral vessels, with their food supplies, to stop the rise in prices. Forestalling and regrating were made crimes. The first year of the war a hundred of the four hundred banks in England closed their doors, and in 1797 the Bank of England ceased the payment of its notes in gold, and did not resume specie payment until four years after the war was over. Paper money fell to a discount of fourteen percent. in 1810. Napoleon's Berlin decree blockaded the Continent to England, and his Milan decree blockaded England to the Continent, with the result that in 1809 thirty-two cotton mills in Manchester alone became idle. Indeed, English commerce was almost par-

alyzed. Warehouses were soon clogged with goods, and no more goods could be manufactured. Byron describes the scene:

“The idle merchant on the useless quay
Droops o’er the bales no bark may bear away,
Or back returning sees rejected stores
Rot piecemeal on his own encumbered shores.
One starved mechanic breaks his rusty loom,
And, desperate, mans himself ’gainst the coming doom.”

He said that he had seen no such squalid wretchedness in Spain or Turkey as he had seen in our Christian country in 1812. In 1813 the premium on gold was twenty-nine per cent. As gold rose in value, prices went up with it; and as paper money went down, wages went down with it. A workman’s wages of ten shillings bought for him little more than seven shilling’s worth of goods bought by the merchant on the gold level of prices.

However, the national revenue doubled each decade of the war. Commercial men agreed to take Pitt’s bank-notes and subscribe to his loans. The annual expenditure rose from twenty million pounds in 1792 to a hundred and six million in 1814, when the national debt had climbed from two hundred and forty million pounds to eight hundred and eighty-five millions. Exports increased in the same period from eighteen to fifty-eight million, and the population rose from fourteen to nineteen million inhabitants. During the peace of 1802, the number of marriages, which had fallen to sixty-nine thousand in 1800, rose at once to ninety thousand.

The weavers and cotton-spinners said, “Our troubles began with the war with France, when the law that fixed the minimum wage and the law that fixed the price of provisions according to the rate of wages, and the law that limited the employment of apprentices, were all abrogated.” Fortunes were made during the war, but the lot of the working people grew worse and worse. Low as wages were, they were lowered still more by the method

of paying by tally, by credit at the factory store, where goods had to be purchased at exorbitant prices. Gangs of children were sent from London to the cotton mills, with no human being to whom they could look for redress. They were bought and sold as slaves. The manufacturers agreed to receive one idiot child in every batch of twenty. They were taken in factories as young as seven, and even five, and in coal mines as young as four. This called from Mrs. Browning her "Cry of the Children." When in 1819 the hours of the children working in a factory were reduced to twelve, the law was condemned because it encouraged idleness and vice.

The spirit of the workingman was broken by the insolence and the meanness of his employer. His meetings were infested with spies of the Government, which combined with capital against labor. If a master broke a contract with his men, the worst penalty was a fine. If the men broke a contract, the least penalty was a term in prison. The factory system with its fines made the workmen slaves. Men in distress get out of humor, will not listen to reason, and wreak their vengeance on the machinery that takes away their work, or on the butcher and baker, whose prices they cannot pay. In Blackburn every power-loom was broken. In 1811, when stocking and lace frames run by power were introduced, to the destruction of the trade of the hand-loom, the distracted men broke the machines until breaking of looms was made a capital offence. Byron attacked the law, and proposed a Jeffrey for judge and twelve butchers for the jury. After two years it was repealed. Byron aroused men to wrath. He expressed the feelings of the multitude, and awakened a universal response of unyielding resolution.

"Yet, Freedom, yet, thy banners torn but flying,
Stream like the thunder-cloud against the wind."

When Macaulay boasted that "nowhere does man exercise such dominion over matter," it would have been

quite as true to have said, "Nowhere does matter exercise such dominion over man." The people had a double fear,—militarism, and its twin evil, wealth. For,—

"Ill fares the land to hastening ills a prey,
Where wealth accumulates and men decay."

At the outbreak of the war the people had been loyal to Church and King, and they had cursed the Reformers as Jacobins and atheists; but after forty years of ever-increasing oppression by the Church and the King, they cursed them both, and hailed Byron, Shelley and Cobbett as their only friends. Hunger and famine taught them the first lessons of reform. When bread was high, and hours were long, and wages were low, and work was so scarce that they had to underbid each other to get it, they began to complain, and hold meetings to protest; but they were dragooned by new laws, which treated complaints as sedition, and protests as anarchy. Coleridge showed some pity for the wage-earner when he wrote in "The Friend," "Those institutions of society which should condemn me to the necessity of twelve hours' toil would make my soul a slave." While the rich were oppressing the poor, the Government was always afraid that the poor would oppress the rich. The chief concern of the Government seemed to be to keep working men out of mischief. The longer the hours of labor, the less time there would be for dissipation. All the profit is made in the last hour of work, they claimed. Appeals were made to charitable people to relieve the distress, but charity only aggravated the feelings of honest workmen. As every one admits now, charity is no way to settle the question of the share the laboring man should have in the profits of his labor.

The pauper population, which had counted two million in 1785, was doubled in twenty years. The poor rates, which were two million pounds in 1793, were trebled before the war ended. In 1817 one-fourth of the population of Liverpool were on the town. Edwin Chadwick (the

Tom Thurnall of Kingsley's "Two Years Ago") found that paupers were largely made by preventable diseases, that threw men out of work, and threw their families on the town. The diseases produced listlessness, mental inertia, and desire for alcohol.

The masses of the people inspired the Government for forty years with ever-increasing suspicion and dread. The old English rights which had been enjoyed for centuries were taken away. The whole nation was in a state of siege; not so much by Napoleon as by Pitt and Castlereagh and Wellington. Combinations of laboring men were dreaded then as the Industrial Workers of the World, the Syndicalists, and the Bolsheviki are regarded by us now. In 1800 there were forty laws on the statute books against the combination of laboring men to raise wages or shorten hours, and new and more drastic measures were adopted to prevent the rise of trade unions. The shock of the French Revolution had completely reversed the attitude of the British Government to the British people. Their peace of mind was gone. They believed every story concocted by informers and spies. Instead of listening to the righteous demands of honest laboring men, they turned the militia and the yeomanry on them. The expense of living had increased until it reached an amount five times as great as it had been before the war; but nothing was done except to overawe the hungry people. To carry on the war, everything that the laborer used was heavily taxed.

The misery of the common people was explained by Malthus as due to the increase of population. The land cannot feed so many mouths. Ricardo said, "The fund for wages depends entirely on the proportion of population to capital." Pitt said, "Supply and demand, prices and wages, must be left to find their own level." Such were the accepted theories of the dismal science of those evil days. Poverty was looked upon by the well-to-do as providential. The poor should not complain against the

laws of nature, which are the laws of God. But when the few grew rich at the expense of the many poor, it was laws of man, and not of nature, that controlled the division of profit. There were laws to keep up the price of corn and of rents, but not of labor, the worker's only capital.

When the promised reforms were postponed, the people were told to wait until the war was over. It is not wise to repair your house in a hurricane. Beware of the awful example of a neighboring nation. Justice Braxfield declared that preaching reform in a time of excitement is sedition. The war inflamed the hatred of both rulers and employers. To speak of men as citizens, as in France, aroused suspicion that the speaker was an atheist. The new laws made new crimes. The undue severity of the criminal code defeated its own object. From 1811 to 1818, one hundred forgers were hanged. The criminal cases tried increased from forty-six hundred a year in 1805 to fourteen thousand in 1819. In that year there were two hundred kinds of capital offences. The liberty of the press was assailed as it had not been since the days of the Stuarts. Every political writer was in peril. Before the right of trial by jury had been taken away, William Hone, a political writer, defended himself three times before London juries, and was acquitted, though he was prosecuted by the Attorney-General himself. Juries would not condemn a soldier to death for begging, or a beggar for stealing from a shop goods worth five shillings. When it was proposed that transportation should be substituted for the death penalty, twelve judges stepped down from their pedestals in protest against the abridgment of their powers of life and death.

Religion did something to improve the condition of the poor. The rustic missionaries of the Evangelical sects heightened the tone of morality, and, by teaching temperance, in so far improved the material condition of many a community. Their Sunday schools furnished the only opportunity that the masses of the poor of England had for

the education of their children. Popular education was frowned upon by rulers and employers alike, because, they said, "It will make the people discontented with their lot, and prove a danger to the State. If they learn to read, they will get vicious and atheistical books into their hands." In 1816 Lord Brougham calculated that there were twenty thousand children in London totally uneducated. In 1820 there were thirty-five hundred parishes with no more means of education than is found among the Hottentots. But still the Government was afraid of the effect of the ink-horn and the alphabet on the poor. Even Hannah More, with her female schools, stopped short at writing, for she said, "I will not make fanatics." When Whitbread urged that nothing conduces to the stability of government like the education of the people, the Government paid no heed. When Bell and Lancaster introduced the factory method into schools and let the older pupils teach the younger, the Church opposed the innovation. In Derbyshire the children of colliers were explicitly excluded from the schools. A bill for general primary education, which was introduced in 1807, was successfully opposed by Justice Eldon and the Archbishop of Canterbury. As late as 1818 only one-fourth of the children of the poor attended school. The president of the Royal Society expressed the opinion that "the education of the laboring class would be prejudicial to their happiness and to their morals, and would make them refractory. More drastic laws would be called for to check their insolence to their superiors." In 1819 the magistrates of Cheshire sought to suppress the Sunday schools.

The year 1815 brought peace, but not prosperity; glory, but not liberty. Government expenditures fell from one hundred to fifty-three million pounds. Imports fell off six million, and exports seven million, because Europe was too exhausted by the war to buy. Copper fell from a hundred and eighty to eighty pound a ton, and iron from twenty to eight. In Shropshire twenty-four blast furnaces ceased working, and seven thousand

iron workers were thrown out of work. Three hundred thousand soldiers and sailors returned to civil life, just when the ranks of labor were flooded, and wages were low, and staple goods had lost half of their value. Wheat fell to fifty-eight shillings a quarter. This caused distress to the farming population, who had succeeded in over-producing wheat. In 1816 ruin stared the farmers in the face. In 1819 Shelley cried:

“No, in countries that are free
Such starvation cannot be
As in England now we see.”

It was to come to the rescue of the farming interest, to keep up land rents and the price of wheat, that the infamous Corn Law had been passed in 1815. By this law no grain could be imported into England until the price had risen to eighty shillings a quarter.

When it was proposed after the war to maintain a standing army of a hundred and fifty thousand men, and to perpetuate the income tax that had been voted to continue only until the war was over, the people were alarmed lest the country, like the Continental nations, was to be saddled with militarism. The years immediately succeeding the peace were the darkest period in modern English history. The battle of Waterloo, which marked the zenith of England's military prestige, marked the nadir of her industrial, social and political life. Until 1822 she was linked politically with the unholy alliance of the Continental powers, who were determined to restore conditions as they had been before the French Revolution, and fasten the chains of tyranny on the people again. Socially, conditions were so bad, that in a village in Dorsetshire, out of 575 inhabitants, 419 were receiving parish relief. The year 1819 was long known as the “black year.”

In 1824 the Chancellor boasted of the prosperity of the nation. Specie payments had been resumed by the Bank of England, the currency was inflated by the issue of paper money, stock companies arose on every hand, but then

England passed through another experience like the South Sea Bubble a century before; but this time it was the South American Trade Bubble. A widespread passion for wild speculation began in 1824, and was followed the next year by a commercial panic. Sixty country banks closed their doors. Even the Bank of England was shaken. Walter Scott was one of the victims of this bankrupt period, which lasted until 1830.

This period of bankruptcy and unparalleled distress coincided with the era of great reforms. It had been a long time coming. The war had made life more and more unendurable, until patience ceased to be a virtue; and when it looked as though another revolution was brewing, and civil war was inevitable, the reactionary government gave way, and let the people have the laws and government they wanted. Much as the Iron Duke dreaded popular government, he dreaded still more the thought of civil war, and for that reason only he yielded to the people. The rumblings of the French Revolution of 1830 reminded him that the English people would not remain supine while their neighbors had again thrown off the yoke of the Bourbon dynasty. But it was only after repressive laws, far from cowing the people, had aroused in them a mutinous and seditious spirit, that fundamental reforms could be forced upon the Government. In 1770 Burke had said, "The people have no interest in disorder. Something must be wrong in the Constitution or the conduct of the Government. The people have no desire to attack: they are only impatient under suffering." In 1817 there was a march of helpless people who implored the help of Parliament in their distress. They marched much as Coxey's Army of the Commonwealth went to Washington. They were called Blanketeers, because they carried blankets to sleep in at night. It broke up itself, as Coxey's stragglers gave out, but not until it had occasioned great alarm. Habeas corpus was again suspended to expedite arrests without regard to justice. That year the Prince Regent declared that the English had the

most perfected system of government in the world; but when the Corporation of London demanded of him the representation of the common people in Parliament, they were snubbed. As a marked expression of the popular resentment, the windows of his carriage were smashed as he was returning from Westminster. In 1819 the massacre of Peterloo occurred at Manchester. A mass meeting was held there. The people came from towns around with flags flying, with a liberty cap held aloft, with "Liberty and Fraternity" as mottoes, and saying, "We, the mill spinners, confined in the bastiles of Manchester, demand annual Parliaments." George Cruikshank pilloried the Administration in "Punch" for turning the mounted yeomanry on the multitude. He pictured horsemen charging men, women and children. The commander is shouting, "So go to it, lads! Show your courage and your loyalty! Down with them! Shoot 'em! They want to take our beef and pudding from us! Remember, the more you kill, the less poor rates you'll have to pay." The Government blamed the agitators, and defended the action of the yeomanry, and proceeded at once to pass the notorious "Six Acts" to prevent the repetition of such a gathering of the people, to prevent all criticism of the Government, to punish seditious libels, and to raise the stamp duty so as to cut off the sale of Cobbett's twopenny "Political Register," which had been the bold tribune of the disfranchised multitude. Cobbett, deprived of the right of a trial by his peers, fled to America. Shelley cried out against

"Rulers who neither see, nor feel, nor know,
But leech-like to their fainting country cling."

At length, when the Government began to yield to the threatening clamor for reform, reforms came rapidly one after the other. In 1828 Lord Brougham said to the Duke of Wellington, "Today not the soldier, but the school-master is abroad." As early as 1808 the revision of the criminal code had begun with the exemption of the pick-pocket from the hangman's noose, until at last Peel struck

a hundred felonies from the list at one stroke. No one was put in the pillory after 1815, and no women were flogged in public after 1817. In 1812 the Five-Mile Act, which forbade Non-Conformists to preach within five miles of a parish church, was repealed. In 1828, by the repeal of the Test and Corporation Acts, Dissenters obtained the right to sit in Parliament,—a right which Daniel O'Connell secured next year for Roman Catholics by defying the law and running for Parliament in Ireland. A Factory Act, the first of a long series of laws ameliorating the condition of the laboring classes, was passed in 1831, and in 1832 followed the great Parliamentary Reform Bill, which took the control of the House from the land-owners, and gave it to the commercial classes. The bill abolished fifty-six rotten boroughs, and diminished by half the representation of thirty more, while it gave seats to three cities and thirty-nine towns. It was a ten-pound franchise, limited to persons who were able to pay ten pounds rent a year. It was many years before the suffrage was granted to the laboring man; but much had been gained, because henceforth, not aristocrats, but the great middle class controlled the destiny of the empire. In 1833 the Government paid thirty-two million pounds to redeem from slavery all of the seven hundred and seventy thousand persons who were in bondage within the empire. Further reforms were demanded by the Chartists, who are the theme of Disraeli's novel "Sybil." The hero of the story is a Baptist. Indeed, the whole movement, with its demands for universal suffrage and the separation of Church and State, voiced the aspiration of the Baptists of England. No other denomination approved these sentiments enough to send delegates to the great meeting in 1844. Three of the leaders—Cooper, O'neil and Vince—were Baptist preachers. Many years have since elapsed, and universal suffrage has at last been granted; and now that a Baptist is Prime Minister of Great Britain, the hope of the Chartists for a free Church in a free State may be nearing consummation.

A STUDY IN THEOLOGICAL METHOD.*

Lecture I.

Evolution and Theology.

It is recognized as one of the momentous facts in the history of man that during the last hundred years the idea of evolution has laid its grasp firmly upon the human mind.

I.

It is popular to date this movement from the appearance of Darwin's work on the "Origin of Species," but we must not forget that even in the field of biology, with which that work was wholly concerned, the idea of evolution had already been in the minds of men of science for about half a century. The French biologist, Lamarck, and the Scotsman, Robert Chambers, in his book, "The Vestiges of Creation," had already sought to explain the ramifications of vegetable and animal life through a theory of development. Charles Darwin grew up in a world where many minds were already battling with the great problem, and his distinction is that of one who gave to that problem its clearest definition and its most powerful approximate solution.

It is more important still to remember that already in another field, that of philosophy, the idea of development had become a living force. It is the idealistic philosophy and especially the great name of Hegel that must be associated with the first elaboration of the idea which really laid hold, and directed the course, of human thinking.

By Hegel the history of the whole universe was conceived of as the self-realization in time of the eternal and absolute reason, or self-consciousness. He looked upon the course of nature and the history of man as containing

*(Lectures given under the George W. Norton Foundation by W. Douglas Mackenzie, LL.D., President of Hartford Seminary Foundation, Hartford, Conn., April, 1919.)

the successive steps in this majestic drama—the gradual unfolding of the inherent nature of the eternal spirit. The difficulty of the Hegelian philosophy was a double one. In the first place, it seemed to deal with ideas which the ordinary mind conceived of as mere and extreme abstractions. The philosopher assumed that he had analyzed the ultimate nature of that reason which is the ground and nature of all things. When he attempted to summarize this analysis in a formula, his system met the suspicion that no formula can enclose and explain all reality, or that, if such a formula exists, man's mind could not grasp it.

In the second place, Hegel's philosophy seemed to break down when he strove with great learning, ability and exhaustive patience to apply his formula to the actual history of nature and man. At too many points he was accused of forcing facts into his formula rather than discovering their secret nature by the flashlight of its truth. The concrete facts of the world did not seem to yield themselves to the solution which he proposed.

While the work of the idealistic philosophers prepared the mind of Europe to appreciate the conception of evolution when applied to natural science, there arose another form of philosophy which was frankly built out of the assumptions, methods and results of science, and which immediately laid hold of the popular mind.

Darwin's own theory of evolution dealt with the actual world of living things, the origin of species, and confined itself to that. It established two facts: first, that evolution had actually taken place throughout the fields of organized beings; second, that an approximate statement of the method of evolution could be made. This statement is summed up in the Darwinian theory of "natural selection" which contained within it four great principles, namely, the variability of organisms, the struggle for existence in which they are involved from the beginning of each individual life, the survival in that

struggle of those most completely adapted to their environment and the transmission to offspring of those favorable organic adaptations. The third of these principles is that which Herbert Spencer called "the Survival of the Fittest." In the first forms of its exposition this theory seemed to make the whole process purely mechanical. Even when he modified the picture of natural selection by the introduction of the principle of sexual selection, Darwin did not begin to draw, nor did Herbert Spencer draw, what seemed to other thinkers to be the legitimate conclusions. For sexual selection can by no means be reduced to the terms of a mechanical process.

The limits of Darwin's work were surpassed by the bold speculations of Herbert Spencer. Darwin confined himself to the field of biology. Physics and chemistry on the lower end, psychology, ethics and religion at the higher end of our experience were not within his view. But Herbert Spencer promulgated his "Synthetic Philosophy" as a theory of the growth of the whole universe of experience. He began at the opposite end from that which Hegel adopted, amongst what seemed to him the objective and concrete facts. The history of our universe began for him with "matter, motion and force." It was his aim to explain, with these as his original data, how the entire phenomena of the world successively appeared. In order to get his results he assumed the two correlative scientific principles of the conservation of energy and persistence of force. It is true that in the latest editions of some of his works, as Edward Caird, Höffding and others have noted, Spencer admitted that life cannot be accounted for in terms of physics and chemistry exclusively, and that the consciousness of man is also and especially of a nature which cannot be reduced to these terms; but it is also a fact that in the last edition of his "First Principles" he firmly retains the first claim which he made—that from these three data—matter, motion and force—the ideal philosophy must derive all the phenomena of

experience. He seemed to feel that the incidental inconsistencies which had arisen in the development of his philosophy were rather to be endured than a complete revision of the whole of it.

Herbert Spencer held that he could reduce the whole process of evolution to three fundamental principles which he sought to apply for the explanation of the phenomena and history of nature and man. These three principles are those of concentration, differentiation and determination. What we really have again, as in Hegel so in Spencer, is an effort to cover the universe with a formula, to enclose all historical reality within its sweep and to prove that nothing is there which does not yield itself to full explanation in terms of that formula.

The effect of the adoption of the theory of evolution or development upon the whole field of human learning is in very truth immeasurable. Already before the Darwinian and Spencerian point of view had become popular the Hegelian conception of evolution had proved itself of the utmost value in stimulating historical research. In the fields of general history, of religion and its history, of philosophy and its history, this idea of development had sharpened men's minds, had driven them to seek out in minute detail the true sequence of events and to connect them with one another by means of some controlling principle or idea. That which Hegel had done for the study of mankind, Darwin and Spencer did for the study of nature. Natural science made the most extraordinary advances in its whole history. Methods of precision, as well as instruments of precision, were brought to bear upon every fact however minute, however strange, however remote from the main current of human experience, which can be subject to scientific investigation and its methods of experimentation. The world, therefore, owes a very great debt indeed to the advent of this idea. It is not too much to say that it has taken its place permanently as part of the equipment of man's mind. We cannot

think now-a-days without thinking of development. We can study no object, no fact or event in history except under the directive control of this marvelous principle.

Nor, with recent history before us, is it too much to say that the idea of development and even the particular theory of natural selection has profoundly modified the course of man's outward history. One need only pause for a moment to recall the fact that the German mind in its effort to justify its national policies fell back upon the principle of natural selection with its involved ideas of the struggle for existence and the survival of the fittest, It was no accident, but a sign of the times in which we live, a proof of the power of this phase of evolutionary theory, that Von Bernhardt sought to defend his point of view as to the necessity of war by an appeal to what he called "the law of the struggle for existence." And let me frankly say, that to my mind, he is justified in that position if natural selection is the last explanation of the processes of life, and if Herbert Spencer is right that the last appeal for truth, the supreme explanation of man's being and man's history is to be found in the three fundamental data from which he starts, namely, matter, motion and force.

But this brings us to face the fact that the conception of evolution which, through the works of Darwin and Spencer, laid such vivid hold upon the modern mind suffered from serious defects and limitations. I may be allowed a personal reference at this point, for it is over thirty years ago that in an essay of singular wisdom by a man of great sympathies, I came across the warning that the current idea of evolution might prove to be a disaster to the human mind. There was danger, this writer declared, lest that mind should be narrowed and confined in its outlook and in its estimate of the values of things if it took as its sole guide to nature and history the theory of evolution which then reigned supreme under the influence of Darwin and Spencer, and as it was

popularly advocated by Tyndal and Huxley. What did that conception involve when it became the sole key to the study of history?

The evolutionist of the type whom we are considering assumes that all earlier phenomena are the actual and complete causes of all later phenomena; that the lower and simpler forms of existence are the active producers by minute stages of variation of all the higher and more complex forms of existence; that the original appetites of men are the only source of all his later and even his highest appetites; that the loftiest spiritual ideals are elaborations only of primitive instincts and impulses. The key word in this statement—the one which makes the great assumption and presents the heart of the whole problem—is that word **cause** or **produce**. And we must take it seriously, for I believe that this is the word which has narrowed man's mind; which has tended to create a prejudice against those facts with which we are concerned when we speak of man's spiritual life, of all art, and of all religion.

One can trace the effects of this general conception in almost every direction, not merely in theories of the general history of man but in theories also of those phases of his history which we associate more specially with his spiritual and religious life. It has influenced theories of religion and its origin, and therefore theories of its nature and value. It has influenced the course of Biblical criticism, not so much in the details of the work as in the **animus** with which it has been carried on and the general conclusions which have been drawn from it. It has influenced the theory underlying a hundred years of minute, fearless investigation of the life, meaning and person of Jesus Christ. It has influenced theories of the origin, nature and history of the Church. It has also profoundly influenced the course of investigation into the history of economics and thereby has played a large part in the formation of various forms of social, individual, and

political idealism. Of this both Karl Marx and Von Bernhardi are vivid examples.

Only gradually has the fact emerged that the doctrine of evolution must itself undergo criticism, itself become the subject of evolution, ere we can hope to use it in some improved and richer form for the further investigation and valuation especially of the nature and history of man.

II.

When we ask ourselves what we mean by evolution we must at once get rid of the notion that we can speak intelligently about the evolution of the universe as a whole. Since we do not know what that "whole" is, the conception is an unmeaning one, and hence the putting of the question, How has the universe evolved, and the attempted answering of it have both led to much confusion of thought. As Professor A. E. Taylor says (*Elements of Metaphysics*) "evolution itself is only thinkable as a characteristic of processes which fall within the nature of a system which as a whole does not evolve." The task of the careful thinker is, therefore, confined to that part of the universe which we know. It is best to confine it to our own planet, the actual world of our experience. It is true that men of science assume that evolution has proceeded on the same fundamental principles in other portions of the astronomical universe as on this planet, but we know nothing of the facts beyond the limits of the earth. Here is all that we know.

Within this definite limit what we discover is this—that within the range of the history of our world, within the range of our human experience, a number of distinct and irreducible factors co-operate to produce all the ranges of reality with which we are concerned. These factors or elements or causes consist of matter, life, feeling or consciousness, thought or intelligence and moral will. As theists and theologians there is only one theory which we must antagonize, that is that the reality which

appeared first, namely, **matter**, when conceived of and described as operating wholly within its own ascertainable laws, caused, produced, or gave actual being to the rest. That theory which underlies Herbert Spencer's philosophy, at least at its beginnings, would give us a purely mechanical view of life as a whole. It would reduce all realities and all values ultimately to the terms of physics and chemistry. The attempt has failed; and few men, if any, of repute for knowledge and thinking power could be found to defend it today.

Rather do we stand with those who confess that each of the forms of reality named above is an ultimate factor of our world of experience, that each is of an origin inexplicable by science. Together they are the producers of those phenomena with which the various departments of science are concerned. Themselves they are more than phenomena—their ultimate nature can be described only approximately in terms of their behavior. All that science can hope to achieve is the discovery of their modes of operation, the description of their interactions, in that continuous process which we call the evolution, the development or the history of our world.

It is an interesting fact that the inexplicable nature of each of these factors has been recognized by some man of science who stumbled at or failed to see the distinctness of one or other of the rest of them. Thus some men hold that the problem of life is a purely mechanical one, who, however, like DuBois Reymond, recognize that the origin of feeling marks an insurmountable limit in the field of knowledge. On the other hand, there are many who hold that life itself is such an insurmountable limit, but who seem to imagine that life can of itself give rise to intelligence. They are confronted by so severe and faithful an evolutionist as the late Alfred Russell Wallace who maintained strenuously that in man's capacity to form general conceptions, which is the chief characteristic of the human intelligence, we have a new factor or cause in the history of our world.

As a matter of simple fact, careful thinkers ought to confess that each of these elements of reality manifests itself in forms of action or under laws of its own which are incomparable and inexplicable by the laws of the others. Thus the laws of feeling which appear in animal life have no ascertainable basis of comparison with the laws of vegetable life, even although the latter are found to operate under the control of that life which also "feels." The laws of the operation of reason in man's procedures cannot be classed in any sense along with the laws of feeling as such. And of course those who believe in the fact of man's moral freedom insist that therein we find a something whose operation is due to some other cause than that which produces the merely elementary forms of intelligence in the animal world. Concerning these original elements in our world of experience the following positive facts can be stated.

(1) Each of these appeared, to begin with, in dim and faint manifestations. There has been no abrupt transition, no gap across which our observation leaps. Each has begun to operate in minute measures of its power and has only gradually by successive operations attained the full development of its resources amid the conditions of our world. It is within the history of the action of each of these factors, when it has begun to operate among the other phenomena of our world, that the term evolution can be strictly applied. There, it is applied scientifically. When applied to the whole history of our world, the word becomes at once changed in its meaning, and is subject to forms of judgment or valuation which are inapplicable within the particular provinces where these successive factors are studied in action.

(2) Each of these factors, except presumably the first, has found on the surface of our planet a prepared material which it has appropriated, and through which it has worked out its own evolutionary history. Thus somewhere, perhaps in the ocean, a chemical material was

found, called protoplasm, which at some particular crisis came under the control of the factor called life. From that beginning science assumes that life has continually acted, that through all the successive forms of living matter a continuity has been maintained with the first. Or again, at a certain stage in the development of plant fibers there was attained a situation which made possible the action, in these terrestrial conditions, of the new cause which we call feeling or consciousness. Then the history of the animal world began, based upon the elaboration of that fibrous structure of the plant world into the nervous system of conscious beings. Somewhere in the history of the animal world, intelligence, an entirely new principle, laid hold of the structure that had become the organ of feeling, and somewhere again in the history of the animal world, with its ranges of conscious intelligence, the material was prepared for the advent of that moral will which is distinctive of the human kind. Religion insists that now in the mental and social structure of man there is ready and prepared the stuff or material which can be laid hold of by some new and still higher principle or factor—this preparation appearing in the history of man's religious consciousness.

(3) In the third place, it must be very strictly observed that the appearance of each new factor involves no breach of natural law. Each has come in upon its prepared material and acted upon it in harmony with the laws of that material, and yet according to its own laws. The **action** of the older material is modified indeed by the new factor, and this gives rise to certain forms of science which mark the transition, as between inorganic and organic chemistry, or again between animal and human psychology. Perhaps some day we may even have such a transition marked between the religious consciousness in general and that distinctive form of it which is a definite announcement that a new factor has entered into history, in Christianity.

(4) The marvelous co-operation of these successive factors is one of the sublime wonders presented to the investigations of the man of science and to the man of contemplative thought. In human nature itself they are all gathered together, unified, constituting him in very truth the microcosm in the sense that in the unity of his nature all these diverse elements co-operate and give to him that vast range of experience which grows from more to more as he himself grows in knowledge, in character and in power.

III.

For the philosopher or theologian who attempts while looking at this vast drama, this complex story of our earth, many inspiring questions are suggested. One of the most urgent is as to their origin. Whence have arisen these successive factors? I may name here briefly five modes of explanation which have gained some currency in our day.

The first is that which asks us to suppose that the original material of our world even as a molten mass was endowed with the capacity to produce in turn the successive factors which we are considering.

The second is that which dates them all back, as Herbert Spencer did in his last years, to an "infinite and eternal fountain of energy." From this they all proceed. It is from this fountain-head that the consciousness of man is described by him as "welling up."

A third explanation is of the type expounded by the late learned and acute theologian, Dr. D. W. Simon. For this purpose he conceives of God in terms of energy, and he describes these successive factors as forms of energy given off or separated from Himself to become forces operative in time and space.

The fourth is the familiar theory of older theology, which is not the Biblical theology, however, that each form of reality has been created out of nothing by a fiat of God himself.

5. The fifth explanation is that which we associate with the various forms of idealistic philosophy, according to which what we are in search of is not a distinct cause of each class of phenomena, but the discovery of some one principle of reason which embodies itself in and manifests itself through these successive forms of action. The dialectic method by which this theory strives to work itself out has more appearance of scientific method than any of the others.

What I personally feel about the first three forms of explanation is that they are at best poetical. They employ pictures or symbols to suggest a solution which cannot be stated in downright intellectual terminology. They slide over the real problem as it presents itself to reason. Against none of them can we as theists and theologians have any rooted objection. We can do our own work, solve our own problems in the field of theological opinion without resting upon any one of these. It is for science and philosophy and not for theology to attempt to meet the question whether these forms of reality are to be explained in this way or in that. For the theologian, as for the man of science, they are data which enter into that particular range of our experience with which he is immediately concerned.

IV.

Here then is the view of the world of human experience which is presented to us by the present condition of science and philosophy. That experience, the world as we know it, is composed out of the interaction of those fundamental factors which we have named above. They have appeared successively in the history of our planet. It is the task of natural science and of the various departments of human history to trace the conditions under which they have appeared and the continuous story of their action in space and time. To tell that story is to trace the evolution or development, as we call it, of our

world. But science and history when attending strictly to their own business are confined to the phenomena. The inner nature, the ultimate source of each of these distinctive factors is not within the scope of those methods of investigation.

It is the task of metaphysics to be concerned with the investigation of what those factors may be in their inner nature, in their ultimate mutual relations beyond the field of phenomenal observation. From another point of view, that range of reality comes within the consideration of the particular discipline which we call theology. For the human mind is concerned directly and practically with the problem of the reality of those factors and their significance for the meaning of life as a whole and the destiny of human nature. That is the field of religious experience, in which are involved both experiment and thought. If mankind does not exhaust the possibilities of its development upon the surface of this earth but elsewhere must find its true destiny, and if upon human nature, in view of that destiny, forces are now acting which are not material in any sense, but spiritual in the fullest sense of the word, though acting upon it amid and through material conditions, then there must be a department of investigation which deals with that field directly and is concerned with it supremely. That discipline we have learned to call theology. Our present duty is to investigate some of the conditions under which the task of the theologian must be carried on.

The department of theology is usually divided into two sections, namely Apologetics and Dogmatics, or to put it in the more popular terminology, Christian Evidences and Christian Doctrine. Even although with Haering we recognize that in the present emergencies of theological science no hard and fast line can be drawn between them, they must still be considered as forms of statement which have a different motive.

Under the former head inquiry is made into the truth of the assertion which is the heart of all religious expe-

rience and of Christianity in a supreme way, that man is in contact with a form or forms of reality that are what we call spiritual. Man lives in an environment on the higher side of his nature which is as active upon him as the physical environment working through his bodily nature. His total world of experience arises from his conscious contacts with all the spheres which have been named above,—not only the material world and the world of earthly life, but that sphere of reality where intelligent beings exist, whose action upon us is real and momentous. All these forms of reality, material, organic, and spiritual, are woven into the one life of his self-conscious spirit. The process of intelligent valuation by means of which we respond to their influence is the measure in which we realize our contact with them. It is the subjective means by which out of that contact man weaves his history and character.

This is as true of his relations with the physical world as with the spiritual world. There is a mystical element in both, or rather in all directions, which the modern psychologist is all too apt to ignore. He speaks as if mysticism were a word applicable only to man's spiritual life, whereas it is equally applicable in every direction. Nature acts upon the soul of man mystically. Psychologists have been deceived too often by the fact that, on that side of our nature, our contact with objective agencies is through our bodily structure and our sense perceptions. With these the biologist and the physiologist are concerned. Each of these is able to subject to outward and immediate tests his various investigations of the organism through which the natural world makes connection with our spiritual self. Because the psychologist can receive from the physiologist a great mass of data regarding our nervous structure, our brain, and because he can apparently see what happens there while our processes of feeling and intelligence go on, he seems to be dealing with what is wholly phenomenal and directly

intelligible. He can even get himself to say that there is a real parallelism between the processes of our bodily structure and the processes of feeling and thought. In this, however, he is obviously and yet naturally deceived. There is no real parallel in the strict sense of the word between nervous events and thought events; between the physical and psychical processes. They occur together in time, but as a matter of fact not only the nexus between them completely escapes observation or analysis, but a parallelism in strict use of the word cannot be described though it is often asserted. There is, I repeat, no parallel in the strict sense of the term, because you can only speak of a real parallel when you are comparing facts of the same kind. You cannot parallel fragrance with music, nor a straight line with a circle. Even though the circle and straight line lie in the same plane and have two mathematical points in common at their intersections, you cannot apply to them the word parallel. So there is no strict and real parallel between the events in the nervous system and those events in the soul out of which our consciousness makes material for its life. That these diverse classes of phenomena are linked in the experience of the self is one of the irreducible mysteries which merely experimental science cannot surmount, because it cannot deal with the causes of phenomena, except as phenomena.

But further we must recognize the fact that nature does act upon us, and that our sense perceptions are not merely thrusts of our active nature out upon a passive world. They are the active responses of our intelligent self to the intense activity of the outer world. That activity when considered directly results in an experience which is as truly mystical as that which we associate peculiarly with the religious life. When we consider such experiences as the recurrent demands of our physical nature for food and drink, or the powerful effects of nature upon us in the periods of adolescence and of old

age; when we think of the tides of emotion awakened by the resurgent life of spring time; when we think of the intense inner experience produced by music, we find ourselves face to face with experiences whose outer story we may tell in the terms of physics, physiology, and psychology, but whose inner nature can only be described as arising from the contact of ultimate realities with one another. These experiences are all mystical in the approved and strictest sense of the term. It is the environment which in all such cases acts upon us, but the environment is itself the product of factors which lie beyond or behind it. To describe our responses is not to face the whole fact; even to describe the accompanying outer events in terms of physics or biology is not to cover the whole situation. The superphenomenal realities are interacting and the phenomenal world is the result.

In like manner in the region of religious experience, apologetic theology seeks to establish or call attention to the fact that there is a realm of spiritual reality which is in contact with and in constant action upon our natures. The history of religion is the continuous story, not only of man's efforts to understand himself, his relations and his destiny, but it is also the continuous story of the manner in which spiritual reality has been constantly dealing with us, making itself increasingly manifest to the intelligent life of mankind. For theology the history of religion is an account of the manner in which the Divine has been progressively and actively, more and more definitely, invading the field of man's intelligent life. To tell the story in terms only of man's instincts, impulses, and value judgments, is just the same as if an account of our feelings could be satisfactory with only a description of the nervous structure of the body or the relation of that structure to nature as a whole.

These observations are made in presence of the fact that certain psychological methods in the study of religion which are current among us and which announce

themselves as speaking in the name of real science are really working under the tyranny of that theory of evolution which we have described above. That theory, when carried into this region, seeks to explain and account for religious experience and history in terms wholly of our processes of valuation and that in the name of scientific method. As it conceives of that method it describes the rise of religious institutions and the very substance of religious experience in terms of psychic events in a manner which seems to reduce the whole matter to the moonshine of man's emotions, impulses, and desires. Where the psychologist does not deny the reality of the spiritual universe or the reality of God, he yet seeks to reduce the experience usually associated with these, so completely to subjective terms that it is difficult to conceive of their reality having any value. It would seem that man has got the whole thing which we call religion out of the movements of his own subjective life and out of the crying needs of his nature as it faces the tragedies and comedies of an earthly story.

For practical purposes this type of psychology would seem to be satisfied if the spiritual universe, whether real or not, is conceived of, at any rate, as passive, as making no distinct and direct place for itself in this development of man's life.

In this way we can and do get solutions of philosophical and theological problems and accounts of the history of religion which are either perplexingly vague or amusingly and pathetically easy. An illustration of each of these characterizations may be found by reference to an interesting and valuable work on "The Psychology of Religion" by Professor George Albert Coe. In discussing conversion, he admits "that a certain distrust of psychology that now and then appears among religionists is not altogether groundless" for, he says, "there is 'something more' to conversion than the sum of the part processes that have mostly occupied the attention of psych-

ologists." When you ask Professor Coe what that 'something more' is—that "missing thing"—he describes it as "the individual wholeness of self-realization." Surely vagueness could hardly be more perplexing than that! Or take Professor Coe's account of what he calls the shaman, the priest, and the prophet, and you will discover, if you consider his pages in comparison with fuller discussions of the subject, that the solutions which he reaches in the name of psychology are far too easy. Similarly, when Professor Coe deals with genius, especially the religious genius, he seems to find it quite natural to say—"Granted a genuine mental evolution, together with genuine differences between individuals, the way is open for a reasonable recognition of originality in any degree. The degree of it in a particular case has to be determined, as well as may be, by the historical study of the entire situation." The statement may well be admitted if by **entire situation** you are permitted to understand the entire universe of reality. (The Psychology of Religion, pages 13, 176-192.)

Apologetic theology cannot consider its work completed until by serious investigation of all the facts in the case it has established the reality of the divine forces which the Christian faith asserts have appeared in the religious history of man, and has identified for the practical purposes of faith the main stages through which those realities have made themselves evident in the history of man's life. It is the task of theology in other departments, building upon the conclusions reached by the preliminary investigation conducted under the name of apologetics, to study religion, and especially the highest form of it which we call Christianity, as a stage, the latest—presumably the crowning-stage of the evolution of our world. That history must be studied in terms of its own laws, that is of the modes of operation of the Divine Spirit as it (He) deals with the experience of individuals and communities. It must then become clear

that just as in organic chemistry you cannot study the actions of matter without the assumption that the factor called life is present, and without remembering continually the ascertained laws of its own behavior, so in the study of the progressive religious experience of man you cannot explain the facts merely in terms of psychology, which is an account of our responses to objective forces, and forget the presence and action according to its own laws of a higher form of reality. As a matter of fact, theology perishes even in its study of religion in general or of that central and supreme form of religion whose records are in the Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments, and in the life of the Church of Christ, unless the phenomena that are there described are seen to be and are explained as involving the action of God Himself.

Now it is in carrying out this task as thus conceived that theology today may receive both inspiration and guidance from the view of evolution which we have had before us. Let me briefly, and in conclusion, recapitulate the situation.

1. Natural science in all its branches has the task of describing the historical processes which have been produced and directed by the successive factors we have named. Its field is always confined to the phenomena through which these factors or, may I dare to use the word, these noumenal realities act within the range of our perception. The natural sciences have none of them, not even psychology, which is in one way the highest of them, anything to do or to say about the noumenal nature of these factors. Nor have the natural sciences, as such, any power to discuss the meaning of the whole process of evolution which embraces all these phenomena in one vast history. Psychology, as a strict natural science, for example, does not produce the meanings which men assign to the facts of life. It has no authority to say how men ought to value the various elements of their experience. The standards of valuation are data which it must

accept. Its task is to identify the various meanings or valuations which the spirit of man has discovered in the facts of experience. Its task is to study the laws under which, when they are discovered, these valuations are used by man in the course of his experience.

If we are to make progress in thinking, we must be very careful thus to delimit the functions of the natural sciences, to see that beyond the making of tentative suggestions they have severally and in themselves no authority to reach dogmatic conclusions about the direction or, still less, about the final meaning of the whole process with whose several parts alone they are immediately concerned.

2. It is the task of metaphysics to attempt to understand what these ultimate noumenal facts or causes of the successive ranges of phenomena must be. In this work it is of course dependent first of all upon those systems of law which the natural sciences establish as the modes of behavior of these several forces or powers, but it is bound over to attempt an illumination of their nature beyond the tests of natural science. This it can do only by means of analysis, that is, by the testing out of the successive logical attempts to describe them in their separate natures and in their ultimate unity. Metaphysics must also be concerned with the fundamental question as to their origin, their primary dependence upon some one supreme fountain head of all reality. Here we must expect to have various possible solutions proposed which may or may not resemble those which hitherto have been familiar under the names of materialism and idealism, pantheism and theism. I believe that the present break-up and confusion in the world of philosophy, which has been noticed by so many writers, is due to the fact that the view of the world which I have described as the result of a hundred years of science is pressing upon the imagination and challenging the thought of many of the most powerful minds. Hence, some take refuge in **pragmatism**,

a hurriedly created house already tottering to its fall. Some are working afresh at the theory of knowledge that they may have a firm basis from which to enter upon the new task that lies before constructive metaphysics. Some, like Bergson, are already frankly facing the true issue and speaking about it as "**Creative Evolution.**" They are all aware that though Kant described his noumena in purely negative terms, facing the world of phenomena as though they were all of one kind, we are face to face with a world where we recognize various classes of phenomena, each of which must be assigned to a separate kind of causation in that world which lies behind and above them all. Out of this situation and not out of a mere recriticism of philosophies of earlier days we may hope for that new birth of metaphysical philosophy which will refresh again the mind of man and stimulate his higher life in every direction.

3. Out of the same situation we have a right to expect the refreshment of theology, for it is the Christian theologian who has a right, and indeed has it as a peculiar task, to survey the whole process of evolution. He takes into account all the facts that have been before us and he asks not only what has been, but also what is going to be; not only how the world has become what it is, but what the destiny of man must be. Theology is always, in an essential part of it, prophetic. Its face is towards the future. It is concerned with questions of destiny, and that destiny it considers as having reference not only to mankind but even perhaps to the entire world of experience.

The fundamental assertion and presupposition of Christian theology is that the creative power which is within and over all has not been exhausted in producing our little world and human nature. It sees in man's spiritual structure the material upon which a new and super-human factor can exert its own characteristic energy and produce results far beyond those which man himself can

produce by a mere manipulation of his instincts, impulses and moral standards, from his own resources of ingenuity and desire. The peculiar material for this latest stage of evolution is to be found in man's spiritual nature as that appears in all his moral and idealistic activities. The question which theology answers is whether we can find anywhere in history the revelation and convincing proof that such a form or reality has actually appeared. Is there at work upon the nature of man as its particular stuff or material a factor that shall do for human nature what human nature did for the animal consciousness, what that did for the life of the vegetable world when each lifted its predecessor to higher forms of action, into communion as it were with higher forms of reality?

It is the assertion of Christianity that this spiritual material is found everywhere in human nature, that an unseen reality has been working throughout its history, manifesting itself everywhere. For every form of religion has been man's effort to respond to his sense of superhuman powers about him and within him. But definitely in one center of that universal history the material was **prepared**. The Hebrew consciousness was opened to that supreme factor in a specific manner. There the preparation was made morally, religiously, socially, even politically for the entrance upon the open field of man's history of that superhuman power. It is the assertion of Christian theology further that it identifies this factor in the person of Jesus Christ, who "came unto His own." His consciousness was of a form unique in human history, His personality poured itself out upon the human beings around Him after a fashion unparalleled, unapproached. It gathered individual men into a Community, it brought them into unexampled, unexpected relations with the holy and the living and the personal God and Father of all mankind. His personality assumed through death and the conquest of death a relation to human nature which is only described when we speak of His perpetual pres-

ence by His Spirit within the heart of mankind. To Him all parts of the world are immediately present. Over all human lives he exerts His direct and personal force. The force is no longer, so to speak, "blind" for us. It is interpreted by His ministry, by the experience of His immediate apostles. Now through the linking of that story, as it is given to us in the pages of the New Testament with the fundamental experiences of spiritual force which all men have felt directly everywhere, that force becomes open, intelligible. It is itself intelligent, working through principles that have become public property, on conditions that are of universal authority.

Perhaps if theology can come to its task after this method, with this modern conception of reality and development ever before it, it will be able to carry out its ancient and glorious task with its own undying enthusiasm, but with a new sense of contact with the mind of our generation as today it faces the whole of the great experience and the vast history of our world.

II. CORINTHIANS 7:8-10.

John Moncure, Th.M.

The force of this exceedingly interesting passage from the fifth verse to the tenth is sadly obscured by the awkward rendering of the King James Version. Aside from the remarkable confusion of the two words μεταμέλομαι and μετανοέω the stilted style and artificial phraseology of the English entirely fail to reproduce the flavor of the original. The American Standard revision improves the translation in the former respect, but little if any in the latter. The several admirable versions in modern English vernacular, such as the Twentieth Century, Weymouth's, and Moffatt's, give excellent renderings of the passage. They perhaps fail, however, to catch the meaning of ἀμεταμέλητον in verse 10. This form is taken by all translators as a feminine accusative in agreement with μετάνοιαν or σωτηρίαν, the verse being translated in some such way as this: "For godly sorrow produces repentance leading to salvation, a repentance not to be regretted." (Weymouth.)

It seems much more likely that ἀμεταμέλητον is to be construed as an adverbial neuter accusative limiting ἡ κατὰ θεὸν λύπη ἐργάζεται. Why should Paul have thrown into a very practical and particular discussion of a definite situation the gratuitous and weak remark that repentance would never be regretted? The progress of the argument leads the reader to expect to find ἀμεταμέλητον in agreement with λύπη, and the jolt caused by its agreement with μετάνοιαν instead might well justify the conjecture of a primitive error if some other satisfactory grammatical explanation were not available. The momentum of the preceding οὐ μεταμέλομαι in the mind of the original reader might easily overcome any awkwardness of grammatical structure; such unusual constructions being not uncom-

mon in Paul and other forceful writers. We may take ἀμεταμέλητον then as a concise echo of οὐ μεταμέλομαι in verse eight. Paul, and not the one who repents unto salvation, is the one who cannot regret. Verse 10 is not a general aphorism but a succinct summary in truly Pauline style, of the somewhat prolix but necessary explanation of his statement that he did not regret having pained his Corinthian brethren. "For paining you," he says, "in accord with the will of God produces repentance to salvation—so of course I can't regret it."

The following paraphrase of ver. 8-10 with a summary of the preceding verses may serve to make the point clearer.

Paul, having reprimanded the Corinthians with great severity, is afterward troubled with misgivings that he may have been too caustic and thus have done them injury (ver. 9, ζημιωθήτε) and alienated them further from himself. But, when Titus arrives and informs him that his admonition has not only not had these disastrous effects but has produced the desired repentance, and has strengthened rather than weakened the Corinthians' confidence in and esteem for Paul, the Apostle is filled with joy, which expresses itself in these words:

"So that, even if I did hurt your feelings in my letter, **I do not regret it**. And if I was inclined to regret it when I saw that my letter hurt your feelings, even though for a little while, **I am glad of it now**—not that your feelings were hurt, but that they were hurt unto repentance. For your feelings were hurt in accord with God's will, and you would have been wronged by us if they had not been hurt. For the hurting of your feelings in accord with God's will produces repentance unto salvation—that's why I don't regret it—but when the feelings of worldlings are hurt it produces death." (Cf. II. Cor. 2:16) Front Royal, Va.

AUTHORSHIP OF SECOND PETER.

E. E. Northen, B.A., Th.D.

Upon this subject much has been written, but another review of the evidence may not be out of place.

I. **The External Evidence** may be divided into several classes.

1. **Direct Statements of Near Contemporaries** are not numerous, only two having been noted, and these in the fourth century.

Eusebius placed the epistle among the antilegomena. Bigg quotes two passages from his "History", and says, "We gather that *οι πολλοί*, the majority of the church, accepted 2 Peter as authentic; that Eusebius himself doubted, but did not absolutely deny its authenticity; that his doubt rested on two grounds, viz., that writers whose opinion he respected rejected 2 Peter as uncanonical (*παρειλήφαμεν*); and that so far as he knew the epistle was not quoted by the 'ancient presbyters', by those older writers, that is to say, whose works were to be found in the library at Jerusalem, but he probably means, not quoted by name." Eusebius does not state from whom he received his opinion, or who were included among *οι πολλοί*.

The seven Catholic epistles existed in the library at Caesarea, and there is some reason for thinking that they were all accepted as genuine by Pamphilus (Westcott, Canon, p. 393, sq.)

Jerome (346-420) refers to the epistle in three different documents. In one he accepts all the Catholic epistles without reserve. In another he observes that there was considerable doubt as to the authenticity of 2 Peter, and ascribes the doubt to the style of the epistle, and in a third he suggests that this difference might be accounted for by the supposition that Peter employed different

interpreters for his two epistles. Nevertheless it was on the authority of Jerome that the doubt was laid to sleep in the Greek and Latin churches.

2. **Quotations by Near Contemporaries** are also few in number.

Clement of Rome (93-95) uses several words and phrases which in the New Testament are peculiar to 2 Peter. Such are ὁ προφητικὸς λόγος, μῶμος μεγαλοπρεπής. He also says Νῶε ἐκήρυξεν μετάνοιαν, which suggests 2 Peter 2:5 Νῶε δικαιοσύνης κήρυκα, If his usage of these terms is a mere coincidence it is at least striking.

Clement of Alexandria (ob about 213). It is both affirmed and denied that he quoted the epistle. Several of his expressions seem to have been derived from it, especially τὴν ὁδὸν τῆς ἀληθείας and σάρκος ἀπόθεοις, the last word being peculiar, in the N. T., to Peter's two epistles. He does not quote the epistle by name.

Origen (ob 253) might have been quoted as making a direct statement, and also as quoting the epistle. He is not so positive as Eusebius, but records the doubt as to authenticity, though he is not unwilling to accept it. Bigg notes that, though a keen critic, he says nothing about the style. In his works are found six quotations and two clear allusions to the epistle, though the authenticity of this part of Origen's work is questioned, the quotations being found only in the Latin version of Rufinus.

Methodius (martyred in the Diocletian persecution) expressly quotes 2 Peter 3:8, and has another passage that strongly suggests 2 Pet. 3:9-13.

If we accept the view of Spitta (quoted in Hastings Dict.) that Jude was later, we have here the earliest quotation (Jude 17 from 2 Pet. 3:3) and several reflections of the epistle.

Meyer says that the fact that the epistle is not mentioned by the earliest Fathers is the more surprising when it is considered how important the polemic it contains against errors of the worst kind.

Bigg takes a very different view, saying that it is short, "its subject, the disorders in a particular section of the Church, is of limited interest, and is treated in a vague and general way, very unlike that in which the same topic is treated in 1 Corinthians, and conveying little information about the persons and circumstances in view; and it contains very few quotable phrases. It is probably very seldom quoted even in the present day. Yet its attestation is strong; if we accept the evidence of the Apocalypse of Peter, very strong; and if we accept that of Jude, overwhelming."

F. C. Cook (Smith's Bible Dict.) maintains that few quotations would be expected, as it was addressed to a portion of the Church not then having much intercourse with the rest of Christendom; and further that there are too few documents of the period extant to justify an argument against its genuineness from such omission.

It is possible that no reader of this paper has quoted from 2 Peter in any letter in many months, and yet we all know of its existence.

From this point of view, therefore, we may conclude with Cook, that it is easier to account for the silence of the early writers than it would be to account for the later admission of the epistle to the canon after the question as to its genuineness had been raised.

3. References by Near Contemporaries.

The **Apocalypse of Peter** (probably about 120-140), if it is accepted, bears in many places strong attestation to the epistle as a genuine work of the Apostle Peter.

Aristides (Apology, probably about 129-130) speaks of ἡ ὁδὸς τῆς ἀληθείας ἥτις τοὺς ὀδεύοντας αὐτὴν εἰς τὴν αἰώνιον χειραγωγεῖ βασιλείαν, which is so similar to the expressions of 2 Peter 1:11 and 2:2 as to suggest a clear reference to the epistle.

Polycarp (martyred 155) has two passages that seem clearly to refer to the epistle, one to the passage just mentioned, and the other to 2 Peter. 3:15.

Justin Martyr (Dialogue 155-160) has several passages that are best accounted for by supposing them to refer to this epistle.

Tatian in his *Oratio* (150-170) borrows the sense of the word *σκήνωμα* (body) from 2 Pet. 1:13.

Theophilus of Antioch (ob. 183-195) uses terms that, while they might have been derived from the LXX, are equally well accounted for by the supposition that they were derived from 2 Peter 1:19-21.

Hippolytus (ob. about 225) has several passages that are more easily accounted for as coming from 2 Peter than in any other way.

Firmilian, Bishop of Caesarea in Cappadocia, apparently regarded this epistle as genuine for in a letter to Cyprian he says that Peter and Paul have condemned the heretics *in epistolis suis*. But Peter does not mention such heretics in his first epistle, while he does in the second.

Meyer summarizes the early evidence as follows: "The result of an unbiased examination is that in Ignatius there are to be found no references to 2 Peter: in Clement of Rome, Barnabas, and Polycarp, none in any way probable; in Justin Martyr, Hermas, and Theophilus none certain; and further that Irenaeus cannot be looked upon as a guarantee for the existence and authority of the epistle in the early church."

Notwithstanding this statement the fact remains that the evidence from silence is in no degree sufficient to offset the various references that are reasonably clear, and the opinion that placed the epistle in the canon.

4. **Opinions of those who may have had access to evidence lost to us.**

We have no means of knowing with any degree of fullness the evidence upon which the epistle was admitted to the canon. Certainly it was not simply because it was professedly written by Peter, for there seem to have been a number of other writings attributed to him that were

not admitted. There must have been evidence then extant that is lost to us, and this added to what we have was felt to be sufficient to establish its authenticity.

After the time of Eusebius it was generally treated as canonical, though Gregory (Nazianzus) seems to indicate a question as to it, and Hieronymus, who himself holds to its genuineness, remarks that its Petrine origin is denied by most.

The doubt as to its authenticity appears to have been most strongly felt in the Antiochene church, and rested largely on the absence of the epistle from the Peshito, which recognized only three of the Catholic epistles—James, 1 Peter, 1 John. There seems to be a doubt whether the Syriac version originally included even these. In spite of its absence from the Peshito, Ephraim Syrus did not doubt its genuineness, through many in the Syrian church did.

Jerome, who recognized the fact that the epistle was rejected by most critics because of its stylistic deviation from 1 Peter, was largely responsible for its general acceptance.

So the matter seems to have been settled until in the Reformation period its authenticity was again doubted by Calvin and Erasmus.

It was formally admitted to the canon by the Council of Hippo in 393.

II. **Internal Evidence**, includes various points of view.

1. **The Claim of the Epistle itself.** It is certain that the author intended to make himself known as the Apostle Peter, calling himself "Simon Peter, a servant and an apostle of Jesus Christ." Strangely enough, this fact has been urged against its authenticity. But there is nothing unnatural or improper in his thus mentioning himself, his former preaching, his relation to the churches, and especially that event in his life in which he witnessed the glory of Christ. From what we know of Peter, the high estimate he placed on his position as an apostle,

and his experiences we should expect such references. The surprising thing would be if there were none such.

Meyer says that the only evidence of its authenticity is the statement of the writer that he is the apostle. Ordinarily this would settle the matter, and would probably do so here but for the differences in style, and certain statements that will require later consideration.

If the epistle was written after Jude a forger impersonating Peter would never have quoted Jude, but Peter, feeling his apostolic authority, would have no hesitation in doing so. On the other hand if Jude is later than this epistle, he doubtless knew whether or not it was genuine, and would not have quoted from a forgery.

2. **Anachronisms** are alleged against its origin in Peter's time.

Chase (Hastings Bib. Dict.) holds that only by an unnatural interpretation can 2 Peter 3:4 and 3:15 be made to harmonize with a time within the possible limits of Peter's life.

The heretical denial of the second advent of Christ and the final judgment of the world connected therewith had not, it is claimed, come into being at this time.

Meyer says that there is no other indication in the N. T. that the **Parousia** of Christ was called in question, yet the denial of this is so closely connected with that of the resurrection that it could easily have found expression while Peter was yet alive. But he adds that the questions of the false teachers (2 Pet. 3:4) seem to indicate a period later than Peter.

It is quite evident that there was, from the first, a general expectation of an early return. The words of Jesus (Matt. 16:28), and of the angels on the day of the ascension (Acts 1:11), and other words led them to expect an immediate return of Jesus, and when some thirty-five years have passed without his return there is room for the unbeliever to taunt. Meyer admits that when Clement of Rome in his second epistle combats this same heresy

it is in an advanced stage. Here it is evidently just beginning and would run to an advanced stage in the 60's, or thereabouts, and would pass before the writing of Clement.

A similar statement might be made as to 3:15sq., and there seems nothing whatever in this to indicate a later period.

There does not seem to be any motive apparent for a later forgery as the epistle lacks just those anachronisms that would be expected in such a case. It neither supports nor antagonizes any hierarchical pretensions, nor, with the single exception of the doctrine mentioned, does it bear upon the controversies that are known to have belonged to a later age.

3. Likeness to Accepted Work of the same Author. As to the general likeness it may be said that both the epistle of Peter and his speeches as recorded in Acts are hortatory.

a) **The Vocabulary.** According to Thayer's summary there are 63 words peculiar to 1 Peter, and 57 peculiar to 2 Peter, while only one (*ἀπόθεως*) is common to both while peculiar to Peter.

This is indeed a small point of resemblance in peculiarities, but when their length is considered it is less striking than in the case of Paul, in whose longer epistles and Philemon, there are words peculiar as follows: Romans, 113; 1 Cor., 110; 2 Cor., 99; Gal., 34; Eph., 43; Phil., 41; Col., 38; 1 Thess., 23; 2 Thess., 11; Philemon, 5. But with 627 words peculiar to these 10 epistles only 110 are common to two or more of them. There are 213 words peculiar to the epistles to the Corinthians, but only 4 of these are common to the two epistles. There are 34 words peculiar to the two epistles to the Thessalonians, and not one of these is common to the two.

It is rather striking that when Peter (2 Pet. 1:15) is about to mention the transfiguration he uses the same word (*ἐξόδος*) in referring to his own death that Luke uses

(9:31) in recording the conversation at the transfiguration, a word that occurs elsewhere only in Heb. 11:22.

b) **Forms of Expression.** Certainly the style of the two epistles is different, but the subject requires too much space for consideration here.

According to Meyer κύριος in the second epistle, when used without further definition, means God, but in the first epistle, except in quotations from the O. T., is used of Christ. He also says that there seems to be a difference in the usage of Χριστός and Ἰησοῦς.

Cheyne and Black (*Encyclopedia Biblica*) make a point of the difference in the name and title of the author as given in the two epistles: 1 Peter, "Peter an apostle of Jesus Christ"; 2 Peter, "Simon (or Simeon) Peter as servant and apostle of Jesus Christ." Certainly there is a difference but it seems to me no greater than we are accustomed to make in our own practice without any special reason. At one time we may close a letter with a letter with "Your friend and brother", at another "Yours fraternally", or simply "Fraternally", or even "Very sincerely", and all these letters may be addressed to the same individual.

A study of the usage of Paul will show an even greater variation, and it would seem that such variations are not so uncommon that an argument against the authenticity of an epistle could be based upon them.

Meyer suggests that καλεῖν and ἀρετή are used much alike in 1 Pet. 2:9 and 2 Pet. 1:3; that we have ἀμώμον καὶ ἀσπίλου in 1 Pet. 1:9, while in 2 Pet. 3:14 we have ἄσπιλοι καὶ ἀμώμητοι; and also that there is a similarity in the closing verses of the two epistles in the use of στήτε in 1 Pet. 5:12, and of φυλάσσεσθε and αὔξάνετε in 2 Pet. 3:17, 18.

Perhaps the best explanation of the differences in the expression is to be found in the supposition that Peter used Sylvanus as an amanuensis in the first epistle, permitting him much liberty of verbal expression, while the second was written either by Peter himself or by a different amanuensis.

c) **The Teaching.** This also has been used as an argument against the common authorship of 1 and 2 Peter. Some have found it difficult to believe that the two could have been written by the same author because of their different content. As well might we deny the common authorship of "Making God in the Ministry" and "A Grammar of the Greek New Testament". In fact the difference in the case of these books is much more marked. What difference there is between the epistles is doubtless due to the different aims.

Meyer says that the first was to indicate to the readers their true conduct under the persecutions they had to suffer, while the second was to protect them against the heresies of the Libertines which threatened them.

The Students' Chronological New Testament indicates a somewhat similar view to the effect that in 1 Peter he is not discussing doctrine so much as practical courage and faithfulness in the trials of the times. In 2 Peter the readers are also exhorted to holy living, the writer having in mind the Gnostic heretics, and warning Christians against their erroneous views as well as comforting them by the sure promise of the second coming of Christ.

In both, as Meyer shows, much use is made of the O. T., and there is much attention to the second coming of Christ, and to preparation for it by a holy walk. The readers are shown that to be Christians, as they were, is to be in the right and true state of salvation, and they are exhorted to prove it by their holy behaviour.

But while the prominent feature in both epistles is the Parousia of Christ, the manner in which it is spoken of is different. In the first the prevailing conception is the *ἐλπίς*, in the second, the *ἐπίγνωσις*, neither term being used in the other epistle. In the first the second advent is imminent, in the second it is to be sudden, but not mentioned as near. In the first the stress is laid on the glorification of believers which shall accompany the return of Christ, in the second the main stress is on the catastrophe

accompanying it. In the first the advent is the ἀποκάλυψις in the second it is the παρουσία. So, at least, says Meyer on this point.

Another objection to the Petrine authorship is the want of reference to the essential facts of salvation. In the first epistle the saving truths of the death and resurrection of Christ form the basis of the ἐλπίς, and of the Christian's moral life; in the second these are nowhere mentioned, so at least it is claimed, and that this is very strange for Peter. The same objection could, however, be urged against the Robertsonian authorship of the Grammar to which reference has been made, for though a minister of the Gospel, the author has nowhere in its 1367 pages, made a statement of the plan of salvation. The same reason holds good in both cases. It was not the purpose of the writer.

In spite of all these seeming differences this second epistle has the same general view of the gospel that Paul preached, and has almost the practicalness of James.

4. How far does the Writer Show that he Holds the Relations that are known to have existed between the reputed author and others.

a) **To the people to whom he is writing.** He does not say that he has ever visited them. Chase thinks that this may be implied in 1:12 sq. and 3:2. Apparently this implication is made to rest on the expression as to putting them in remembrance. But in neither instance does he even intimate that the things they are to remember are those that he has personally communicated to them. In the first case these things are those that they have received just as he has, or just like those that he has received, i. e., the common experience of faith which all Christians have. In the second case he particularly specifies "the words that were spoken before by the holy prophets, and the commandment of the Lord and Saviour through your apostles." We know too little of the journeyings of Peter or of the other apostles to be able to say

which of them had visited those to whom the epistle is addressed.

But even if we knew that Peter had not visited them it would not affect the authenticity of the epistle, for Paul had never been to Rome when he wrote his epistle to the Christians in that city, and doubtless there were other apostles who, hearing of conditions where advice or comfort was needed, addressed letters to those they had never seen.

In 3:1 he does say that he had written them an earlier letter, the object of which had been the same as the object of this, viz., to arouse their minds to a remembrance of the truth as it had been conveyed to them. This need not mean that the same sort of things were to be said, or conditions met, as we have seen they were not. The document that we know as 1 Peter meets the requirements of this statement, and apparently the author, whether the apostle Peter or another, had this in mind. Spitta maintains that Peter wrote this epistle late in life to Jewish Christians to whom both he (3:1) and Paul (3:15) had addressed letters which have not been preserved.

b) **Relation to Jude.** Meyer compares Jude 12 with 2 Pet. 2:13, and Jude 12, 13 with 2 Pet. 2:17, and says that the use and variations here do not cause the firmness of the line of thought to suffer. He adds that the strangest thing is that Peter should copy from a non-apostolic letter. Spitta, as quoted by Chase, reminds us that Peter promised to make provision that after his death his friends shall be reminded of his teaching, and claims that the epistle of Jude was thus written at a later time for the express purpose of carrying out Peter's intention. He says that there are several direct references to 2 Peter (e. g., vv. 4, 5, 12), while in Jud 17 sq. we find words from 2 Pet. 3:3, quoted as apostolic.

Evidently the relation is close between Jude's epistle and 2 Peter, but which is dependent on the other it is difficult to say. There is much to be said on both sides.

Dr. Robertson (in his *Students' Chron. N. T.*) places Jude in 66 and 2 Peter in 67, but is not at all positive in his statements, saying of Jude, "His epistle was perhaps used in 2 Peter, or he made much use of 2 Peter 2. It is more probable that the longer work used the shorter and more vivid one"; and again of 2 Peter he says, "We have put it after Jude, but that point is not entirely certain."

Under such circumstances this writer does not attempt to determine the relation between the two epistles or their authors further than that there was a close relation between them which, to say the least, is not unfavorable to the Petrine authorship of 2 Peter.

c) **Relation to Paul.** The relation between Peter and Paul we know, from Acts, to have been intimate, and while their view point was in many particulars very different, on essential things they were agreed and they loved each other as Christians.

In this epistle the author calls Paul "our beloved brother" and indicates an acquaintance with at least some of his epistles. 1 Peter, in many places indicates that Peter was familiar with these epistles, so that the remark here is not strange, but perfectly natural as coming from Peter, while a forger, writing later would hardly have used the expression that is in 3:15, 16. There is no need to force into 3:16 a meaning to include all the Pauline epistles that we know, though he might have included many that are lost to us, and certainly there is no reason to suppose that τὰς λοιπὰς γραφάς refers to any collection of N. T. writings. He is saying, just as Peter, from his observation, would be apt to say, that as they have wrested the Scriptures (i. e., the O. T.) to their destruction, so they are using the writings of Paul in the same way.

d) **Relation to Christ.** The description at the beginning is in perfect accord with the known relation of Peter to Christ, and that as recognized by himself. The fact that he fails to quote the sayings of Christ is sufficiently

explained by the limitations he had put upon his epistle, and its evident purpose, which did not require direct quotations, while the whole epistle breathes the spirit of the relation that is known to have existed between Peter and his Master.

e) **Fitness of the Statements as to Peter himself.** Chase (Hastings Dict.) makes the entirely unfair and question-begging statement that the "references which are made to the gospel history are selected as being in harmony with the supposed authorship". A careful study of these references will show that they are those most natural if made by Peter. If made by a forger the omission of Matt. 16:18, while making the references he does, is inconceivable. He appeals to his own experience incidentally, forcefully, and in the most natural way in both letters.

Chase mentions three passages as referring to occasions in his discipleship—1:16 sq., 1:14, and 1:3.

I do not see the application in 1:3, which seems to be a general reference to the common experience of Christians in receiving blessing from Christ.

In 1:16 sq. we have the reference to the transfiguration, at which we know Peter to have been present (Matt. 17:1, 2), and which is used in a most natural way to emphasize the fact that he knew the Gospel to be true. No reasonable objection can be urged against this use of the experience, while a forger would most likely have given more details.

In 1:14 we have a reference to Christ's words as to Peter's death (Jo. 21:18, 19). It is hardly conceivable that a forger would have made the reference in this form. Only the fact is mentioned, while a forger, especially after the death of Peter, had he known of the prediction would have made a more direct reference to the words of Jesus.

But the author writes as one conscious of approaching death. None would feel the sacredness and surety of the words as one who, like Peter, had heard them from the

Lord, and now sees in the persecution of other Christians a movement that is bound soon to reach him as one of the leaders. Truly the references to the life of Peter are most natural.

Conclusions. Only a few of those reached by students may be mentioned.

1. **Mayerhoff** claims that it was not written by Peter, but by a Jewish Christian in Alexandria in the middle of the second century.

2. **Chase** (*Hastings Dict.*) holds that the external evidence of its genuineness is insufficient, there being none before Clement of Alexandria or Origen, and that it is unbelievable that a genuine Petrine epistle could be unknown so long. And when he has reviewed the internal evidence as well he says: "The only conclusion which is in accord with the evidence, external and internal, is that 2 Peter is not the work of the apostle, but is a document that must be assigned to the second century.

3. **Meyer** seems to feel that the argument is so evenly balanced between acceptance and rejection that it is impossible to form a definite opinion.

4. **Weiss** decides, in substance, that the divergences (from 1 Peter) are no hindrance to the acceptance of identity of authorship; that the points of agreement are more than those of divergence, and that the difference of style has been much exaggerated.

5. **Zahn** holds to the Petrine authorship at about 60 to 63, and places Jude about 75 A. D. as quoting 2 Peter.

6. **F. C. Cook** (*Smith's Bib. Dict.*) says, "A majority of names, including nearly all the writers of Germany opposed to Rationalism, who in point of learning and ability are at least on a par with their opponents, may be quoted in support of the genuineness and authenticity of the epistle".

7. **Robertson** (*Stud. Chron. N. T.*) unhesitatingly accepts it as a work of the apostle Peter.

While more might be desired in external evidence,

this is at last as strongly in favor of the Petrine authorship as otherwise; the internal evidence, with the single exception of the style, is unqualifiedly in favor of its genuineness, and as Peter in the first epistle (5:12) uses an expression that may mean that Sylvanus was his interpreter, the difference of style may be easily accounted for by the very reasonable supposition that while Sylvanus was responsible for the style of 1 Peter, either Peter himself, or another "interpreter" was responsible for that of the second.

To my mind we may unquestionably hold the epistle as part of the sacred Scripture presented through him who was commanded to tend his Master's sheep.

BOOK REVIEWS

I. BIBLICAL.

Christianity According to St. Luke. By the Rev. S. C. Carpenter, B. D., Fellow and Tutor of Selwyn College, Cambridge. The Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge, London; The Macmillan Co., New York, 1919. 239 pp.

Professor Carpenter has written a delightful book about Lukan problems, fresh, scholarly, careful, alert, and fair. I got the volume as I started for Northfield, where I was to deliver fifteen lectures on Luke as an Historian in the Light of Research. My lectures were already made, but I found this new volume full of rich suggestions. The discussion is technical throughout, but the author has a charm of style that makes it easy to follow his arguments. I have thoroughly enjoyed the book, even when not agreeing with a minor point here and there. It will help any student of Luke's writings.

A. T. ROBERTSON.

The Prophets in the Light of Today. By John G. Hill. The Abingdon Press. 240 pp. \$1.25.

The revelation of the prophets and their teachings to our day is the theme of this clear and highly interesting interpretation. Dr. Hill sees in the prophets unique personalities which combined insight, foresight, inspiration, and action. They stood as Israel's gifted spokesmen for Jehovah. They differed in looks, manners, temperaments, education and methods much as do ministers of our time. Dr. Hill's graphic and illustrative style, together with his comprehensive outlook on modern world issues, are sure to command attention. Beautiful tributes he pays to The Relentless Amos, The Lovelorn Hosea, The Brilliant Isaiah, The Tragic Jeremiah, The Sensational Ezekiel, The Laconically Blunt Micah, The Church-BUILDER Prophets, The Impetuous Malachi, The Humorist Jonah, The Pensive Daniel, etc. Indeed, we might add that Dr. Hill by studying the prophets has himself become a prophet.

H. C. WAYMAN.

Commentary on the Epistle of Paul to the Romans. By E. J. Bosworth, D.D. The Macmillan Co., New York, 1919. 281 pp. \$1.10.

Dr. Bosworth is New Testament professor in Oberlin Divinity School. He has written the volume on Romans for the Bible for Home and School Series. He is the author of numerous books that have been used by the Y. M. C. A. classes and has the gift of making scholarship practical. He is alive to the difficulties that beset his path in Romans, but he moves easily and safely on the whole. A Baptist is interested to note that on Romans 6:4 he frankly accepts "submergence" and "emergence" as Paul's figure in baptism, using the language of Sanday and Headlam. The introduction is adequate and the comments pointed, though necessarily brief. It is a good handbook, one of the best in the series so far. A. T. ROBERTSON.

A Book About the English Bible. By J. H. Penniman. Macmillan Company, New York. 435 pp. \$2.25.

This excellent book about the English Bible gives a brief account of the immediate sources and their contents; their literary background and surroundings. The forms and characteristics of the constituent books and their relation to each other are discussed. There is a short but comprehensive history of the translation of the Bible into English, from Saxon times to our own day. The chapter on Modern Revisions of the English Bible is able and timely. Attention is also called to the differences between the commonly used English versions as regards contents and translation and to the reasons for the differences. Dr. Penniman has rendered a valuable service. H. C. WAYMAN.

II. PRACTICAL THEOLOGY.

The New Horizon of Church and State. By William Herbert Perry Faunce. The Macmillan Co., New York, 1918. 96 pp. 60 cts. net.

It is doubtful if the President of Brown University ever did a more timely or telling thing for the American public than in giving us this little volume on this vital subject. The work done is both civic and religious in motive and content. It deals with an old question—the relationship of Church and State, but with reference to new world con-

ditions that virtually make it new. The four section titles are most suggestive and winning: "The Return of America to the Founders"; "The Return of Christianity to Christ"; "The Function of the Christian Patriot", and "Obstacles to the International Mind". The discussion of these subjects is at once informing, vigorous and inspiring. Baptists may well feel proud of the author and his new achievement.

GEO. B. EAGER.

The High Calling. By Edwin M. Hoffman. Association Press, New York. 140 pp. 50 cts.

A well-tried discussion of essential boys' problems, written for boys of high school age. The book just fits the boy's pocket. The high calling of Jesus Christ is presented to boys in daily studies for thirteen weeks under the general headings of "The Standard of Character", "The Battle of Character", and "The Investment of Character". The influence for good would be incalculable if the high school boys of America would really study the themes here presented. An excellent book for parents to place in the hands of their sons.

HENRY W. TIFFANY.

Studies in Comradeship. By Theodore Gerald Soares, Ph.D, Professor in Department of Practical Theology, University of Chicago. Volume I from the Old Testament; Volume II from the New Testament. Association Press, New York. 60 cts. each.

The studies were prepared for "Comrades in Service" of the American Expeditionary Forces, and are applicable to all who desire a better world in which comrades may dwell. These books were written to present the Bible as a book of comradeship; to reveal God as the comrade of man "in the endeavor to make the world a happy, wholesome place for men, women and children to live in". Each volume is arranged for brief daily study and group discussion for two months. The general headings are "Stories of Comradeship", "Champions of Comradeship", "The Comrade Hope", "The Unseen Comrade" in Volume I; in Volume II, "The Gospel of Comradeship", "Early Comrades", "An Experiment in Comradeship", and "The Comrade Hope". Well adapted to the purpose for which written, they should appeal to all manly young men.

HENRY W. TIFFANY.

Religio Grammatici; The Religion of a Man of Letters. By Gilbert Murray. Houghton-Mifflin Co., Boston, 1919. 49 pp. \$1.00 net.

If one wants a setting forth of the religion of a broadminded liberal in portable form and taking style this booklet of Professor Murray will give it to him. Its chief merit, indeed, is this, that it shows how it is that in the very scholarship of the right kind of scholar there is a deep religious element. The book may be counted on to take its place among the briefer classics in this field.

GEO. B. EAGER.

Building the Congregation. By William C. Skeath. The Methodist Book Concern, New York and Cincinnati. 63 pp. 50 cts.

A study of appeals for church attendance. The author thinks that preaching and pastoral work are increasingly inefficient in building up a congregation for reasons which he gives. Religious publicity must be relied upon and an appeal is made that church advertising aim to build up a congregation of worshipers rather than an audience of hearers. Much of the present-day advertising disintegrates, not builds the congregation. The volume is worthy of study by those seeking the right appeal for church publicity.

HENRY W. TIFFANY.

Hearts Courageous. By John Oxenham, author of "The Vision Splendid", etc. The Abingdon Press, New York and Cincinnati. 93 pp. 50 cts.

A book of short poems interpreting the experiences of the men at the front and the loved ones at home in the great war when Good and Evil were fighting to the death for the Soul of the World. A call that we "think, work, pray, and in every way possible strive to the uttermost for that Righteous Peace and Nobler Living for hope of which so many of our best and dearest have died". One can scarcely keep from quoting some of these poems, even in a review, but once started it would be difficult to stop. Any one of many poems is worth several times the price of the book.

HENRY W. TIFFANY.

Mountains in the Mist, Faces in the Fire, Mushrooms on the Moor. By F. W. Boreham. The Abingdon Press. \$1.25 net each.

These stories and essays are read with sheer delight. Wonderful is the touch of this original mind. It is good that this writer, so popular in England, has been discovered in America.

How to Teach Religion. By Geo. Herbert Betts. Abingdon Press, 1919. 223 pp. \$1.00 net.

This book, unlike so many of similar nature, is very readable as well as helpful. The author's fitness to instruct teachers is evidenced on every page. His deep conviction as to the importance of right religious teaching gives this volume an added value over many purely scientific works. His fundamental assumption is that "children can be brought to a religious character and experience through right nurture and training in religion". Believing this, he presents both sane and comprehensive principles and methods. The book has superior value also in that it is so produced as to serve both the trained and untrained teacher. It will give new light and inspiration to thousands of unselfish men and women who are seeking to reproduce the Christ life and character in the growing childhood of our day.

F. M. POWELL.

The Temple. By Lyman Abbott. The Macmillan Company. 171 pp. \$1.00.

The many admirers of Dr. Abbott will welcome the re-issue this week of his book, "The Temple", which has been out of print for some little time. The purpose of the book is to interpret the laws of the body and of the spirit and to describe human experience as it is and as it ought to be. Hence the philosophies of the psychologists and physiologists are not expounded. The work is practical and devotional, not technical. It is indeed a book of religion—the life of God in the soul of man. It describes and portrays the Christian's faith in man. In these fourteen short chapters, Dr. Abbott shows how the temple of the body may be kept holy and thus healthy; and how the spirit may be made a worthy occupant and master of the body. The reflections about the practical problems of daily life are full of wise counsel for men and women.

H. C. WAYMAN.

III. MISCELLANEOUS.

The Assurance of Immortality. By Harry Emerson Fosdick. Association Press, New York, 1918. 116 pp. 60 cts.

The great war has aroused fresh and world-wide interest in this subject. Whatever freshness of thought this essay may possess, the author suggests, will be found in the fact that the problem of life after

death is viewed from the standpoint of the twentieth century and is discussed in terms of the special difficulties and the prevailing attitudes of today. He has had in mind especially the man who conscientious and courageous about his daily work, lifting his thought occasionally to the problem of life everlasting, turns away saying: "What difference does it make? I can at least do my present task well, and if there be a world beyond face it when it comes." He is convinced that there are considerations which such an attitude, admirable as it is, leaves out of account, and to these the attention and effort of this essay are especially directed. The work he has done is both negative and positive: he shows the inconclusive nature of the arguments commonly urged against a future life; and gives the positive reasons for a modern man's assurance that death does not end all.

GEO. B. EAGER.

The Letter He Was Ashamed of. By Harvey Smith McCowan, 118 N. Clinton Ave., Dallas, Texas.

A significant story of a Christian "boss" and a convention of salesmen by one of them, also a Christian. It will repay reading by not only commercial travelers and salesmen, but by all sorts of people—preachers especially—who are interested in christianizing business. Bound in paper, 39 pages, price not given.

GEO. B. EAGER.

From Father to Son. By Mary S. Watts. Macmillan Co. \$1.75.

Another new novel by Mrs. Watts. It is fascinating in every way. The writer brings before the reader a moving crowd of characters drawn with her customary skill and insight into human motive.

George Washington, the Christian. By William Johnson, author of "Abraham Lincoln, the Christian". Abingdon Press, New York and Cincinnati. 299 pp. \$1.50.

Here we have not a volume about Washington, but a book showing the real man. The greatness of Washington is shown to be due to his unwavering faith in God and strict adherence to His teachings. The chronological order is followed from birth till death. The age of Washington and the year being placed at the bottom of each page. Quotations are given from letters, orders to the army, state papers, conversa-

tions, companions, prayers and speeches. No one can read this story without feeling that Christianity is the foundation of all true greatness and an essential to true leadership. There are twelve illustrations, twelve pages of references to books, magazines, papers, with volume and page given, so that any reference may be easily checked, a list of the fifty-four designations of the Deity used by Washington and an excellent index. The work of a master hand, and we hope the author will do a similar work of other Presidents. The reviewer would like to see this volume in every Sunday school, public school, high school, college and university library, for its tremendous influence upon the young people of America.

HENRY W. TIFFANY.

That One Face. By Richard Roberts, Minister of the Church of the Pilgrims, Brooklyn, N. Y. Association Press, New York. 208 pp. \$1.25.

The author seeks "to present the face of Jesus Christ as seen by certain great souls of history". The impression made by Christ upon the poets and prophets—Dante, Shelley, William Blake, Browning, Tennyson, Francis Thompson, Savonarola, Mazzini, and Ruskin. The book is a rare combination of spiritual insight, intellectual keenness, and discernment and literary skill. Here we have not the studied and guarded expressions of theologians, but the spontaneous and often unguarded utterances of layman (Savonarola the only ecclesiastic) speaking facts as they see them, and not in defense of some particular view or tradition. Some of the men studied were not orthodox Christians, and Shelley termed himself an atheist. The book is a real contribution to Christian literature and a most valuable handbook to the Christian pastor. Having read this volume we eagerly await future products from the same pen.

HENRY W. TIFFANY.

From French Mascots to Their American Godfathers. The American Red Cross in France. 62 pp. 1 franc.

A book of letters from French war orphans adopted by members of the American Expeditionary Forces to their soldier friends. The letters are interesting for the tribute to the chivalry of the American forces, the glimpses given of the background of terror in the invaded districts, the light shed on French needs through these revelations of family life in France; the story of mothers bravely struggling to rebuild the family circle in spite of devastation, and vacant places at the hearth.

HENRY W. TIFFANY.

The American Baptist Year Book 1919. American Baptist Publication Society. Rev. Chas. A. Walker, editor.

The 1919 Year Book is well in keeping with former annuals, besides giving some additional features. The editor deserves great credit for his arduous and painstaking labor. There are about 330 pages of vital statistics and information which should be of supreme interest to every Baptist.

F. M. POWELL.

The War and Religion. A bibliography of material in English prior to January, 1919. Compiled by Rev. Marion J. Bradshaw for the Committee on the War and the Religious Outlook. Association Press.

The vast amount of thinking along the lines of religion during the recent war is made evident by this compact, well-arranged bibliography of books dealing with war and religion. The number of books in English which would never have been written but for the great war is enormous (many of these should never have been written). This volume is divided into nine general sections and the books are thus classified under these heads: "I. General Influence of the War on Religion", "II. Religion in the Army", "III. Christianity and War", "IV. The Church and its Task in the Light of the War", "V. Christian Belief as Affected by the War", "VI. Christianity and the Social Problem" "VII. Christianity, the State and Internationalism", etc.

Dr. Bradshaw has done an exhaustive piece of work and one that will commend itself to the student of religion. In such a survey, as one might expect, many unworthy books will be included, and for that reason may get an undeserved circulation.

F. M. POWELL.

Intervention in Mexico. By Samuel Guy Inman. Association Press, New York, 1919. xi-248 pp. \$1.50.

Mexico greatly needs friends. Dr. Inman is a devoted friend of Mexico. He has labored earnestly and successfully as a missionary there. He has come to be recognized as a leading authority on Latin American affairs, social and religious. This book is an earnest argument against intervention and an earnest plea for intelligent, friendly helpfulness.

No longer resident in Mexico, Dr. Inman is none the less concerned for her welfare and has within the present year made a tour through

considerable sections of the country and had a leading part in a conference in Mexico City looking to the inauguration of a large educational enterprise for the culture and development of the people.

He is a firm believer in President Carranza's integrity, purity and the essential wisdom of Carranza's chief aims for his country.

"Various Aspects of the Problem" are presented in Chapter I. The chief emphasis is here upon five reasons why we in our country are apt "to misunderstand Mexico". Examples and illustrations are adduced in support of the analysis.

Chapter II undertakes to establish the thesis that "the present disturbance in Mexico" is "a real revolution", a social revolution based on deep principles and affecting the entire structure and prospects of the national and social life. It cannot, therefore, be suppressed nor thwarted ultimately. The only wise course is to deal with it patiently, sympathetically and helpfully.

Chapter III is occupied with answering the question, "What Kind of Man is Carranza?" It is a noble apology. It undertakes frankly to acknowledge his limitations and shortcomings, but so glosses and counters them as to make Carranza out a very high order of patriot and statesman.

Two chapters, IV and VI, deal with the mutual opinions and relations of Mexicans and Americans. The Americans are made to appear to very great disadvantage.

"The Present Situation in Mexico" (Chapter V) is certainly very widely different from that usually imagined and portrayed in our country.

In it all, one cannot escape the evidences that the author is an advocate of Mexico. One does not wonder that he made "a poor witness" before the U. S. Senate Foreign Relations Committee recently. He is so eager and so earnest that he sees, mainly, the better side of Mexico and Mexicans and he is inconsistent in his dealing with the American newspapers in that he denounces them roundly as prejudiced, unreliable and often venial, only when it suits his purpose to quote freely from these papers as evidence for certain charges which he makes. There is obvious lack of balanced judgment and consistent, discriminating use of facts and sources. The author is apparently unconscious of weakening his argument for the ability and reliability of the present administration and the Mexicans generally, by incidental observations about the people and the officials. For example, as a plea in avoidance for Carranza, we are told that one of his great difficulties in bringing about order is the lack of enough honest men to fill the responsible positions (p. 214).

But when all the weaknesses of special pleading are taken account of—and they are obvious enough—the work remains one of the most

illuminating and righteous of all presentations of the present of Mexico out of which her future must be made. One cannot read the book with open mind without feeling that premature intervention by our country in Mexican affairs would be criminal, costly and possibly futile. Armed intervention will be necessary, sooner or later, unless the spirit of this author can dominate our American attitude. It is not certain that we can permanently evade responsibility for order in Mexico. Certain it is that we should not allow ourselves to be made the tool of greedy exploiters. It is equally certain that no more farcical interventions such as our government was guilty of a few years ago must mar our dealing with our neighbor.

Mexico needs Christianity. If we will give her that speedily we shall solve our part of her problem.

All who know of Dr. Inman's activities in behalf of Latin America will be prepared for his enthusiasm over the partition of the Mexican territory into separate fields for various missionary agencies.

This reviewer thinks that not enough emphasis is laid on the need for evangelization. Nor shall we be strong in our work for Mexico, or any other land, if we evade fundamental religious differences and seek to unite our religion with the native religion for a general welfare, which in that case must inevitably prove a superficial welfare.

I commend the book most heartily to our American people who wish Mexico well.

W. O. CARVER.

History of Religions. By George Foot Moore. Scribner's Sons. 552 pp. \$3.00.

This is the second volume of Professor Moore's great two-volume "History of Religions". The author attempts an impartial account of the development of the three great religions: Judaism, Christianity, and Mohammedanism. The religions are closely related. "A morphological classification might regard them as three branches of monotheistic religion in Western Asia and Europe." The author gives a brief history of the Jewish religion. It is scholarly but quite fanciful at times. He accepts and makes much of the "Kenite legend", also of "Judaean aetiological myth". The author accepts as settled many questions raised by modern criticism, as regards late date of books, etc. He pays a glowing tribute to the New Prophecy, and sees rightly in Israel's history the gradual making known of "the will of God which is wholly moral".

One cannot praise too highly the author's historical review of Christianity. He nevertheless gives too great a place to the influence

of Greek philosophy upon Christian dogma. The chapters on the "Reformation" and "Modern Tendencies" are especially masterly.

The last part of the book is given to a treatment of Mohammedanism which is just and fair. He points out the bad and commends the good as well.

H. C. WAYMAN.

Without the Walls. By Katrina Trask. The Macmillan Company.

This little book of less than two hundred pages, a wealth of thought and beauty, tells the story of a Jewish maiden and a Roman soldier in Jerusalem at the time of the Crucifixion. The pictures of the last days of Christ on earth and the events leading up to Calvary are vivid and make a profound impression. Its beauty consists in thought, feeling and faith. It proclaims a gospel of forgiveness and of life. The keynote is faith, which is indeed timely, for what is needed is a revival of world faith, to make the world safe from war and safe for democracy.

